

0722712
ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION

INDEXED

The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 534

OCTOBER 1937

Vol. 269

- Church, State and Divorce. By Lord Gorell.
Government and the Individual. By W. J. Blyden.
The Problem of the Chough. By Douglas Gordon.
✓ Ancient Monuments. By Major H. F. Chettle, C.M.G.
Extraterritoriality in China. By Ching-Chun Wang, Ph.D.
'Victoria Regina.' 1837-1937. By Sir Ian Malcolm, K.C.M.G.
State Intervention in Industry. By G. C. Allen.
✓ Dr. Johnson in Edinburgh. By W. Forbes Gray.
British Foreign Policy. By Sir John A. R. Marriott.
The British Fisheries. By J. R. Young.
The Sea-Dogs of Scotland. By Alasdair Alpin MacGregor.
The Palestine Report. By E. M. E. Blyden.
Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by the

LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY

(ROBERT J. SPENCE, PROP.)

Sole Agents for American Continent

WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$5.25

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter



THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 534.—OCTOBER, 1937.

Art. 1.—CHURCH, STATE, AND DIVORCE.

ON the concluding day of last session, July 30, the Royal Assent was given, as is customary at such a date, to a number of measures which had duly passed all their necessary stages in both Houses of Parliament. Amongst these was one of which the others must all have whispered to one another, '*Que faisait-il en cette galère ?*' It bore a name which, however appropriate, seemed strange to it, it was sponsored by neither Government nor even party, it—or its near relations—had vainly tried on more than one occasion to be admitted as a member to such august and decided ranks, and, most singular of all, it was by universal consent the most important of the heterogeneous company, interesting, influential, and instructive as doubtless most, if not all, of its colleagues were. It was more, even, than that. There had been innumerable voices raised to assert that it was not merely the most important Bill to be elevated into the status of an Act on that day—which, incidentally, included the Factories Bill—but the most important Bill of the whole session, and further still many considered it more far-reaching in its probable effects upon the lives and happiness of the citizens of this country than any which had come, however officially, before Parliament for many a year. Most people, as far as could be gathered, welcomed its passage: some deplored it, a few gave it publicly as their opinion, founded upon unalterable religious conviction, that it was a 'terrible' Bill. This measure so unusually presented for the Royal Assent was technically known for most of its Parliamentary adventures as Mr de la Bere's Marriage Bill: it was not Mr de la Bere's—except technically; it Vol. 269.—No. 534.

was not a Marriage Bill—except by nomenclature : it was in actual fact Mr A. P. Herbert's Bill for the amendment and extension of the laws relating to divorce. It is now the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1937.

Mr A. P. Herbert is one of the most recently elected members of Parliament ; he sits as Senior Burgess for Oxford University, a constituency which obviously has far more clerical voters than any other in the country ; he had, it is true, long entertained a deeply felt desire to amend our laws of divorce, and had not only written a novel with the ingenious title ' Holy Deadlock ' to bring home, almost in the manner of a modern Charles Dickens, to his host of readers the need for reform, but had boldly and honourably stated in his election address his intention, if elected, to endeavour to translate desire into action. Beyond that he had long deservedly enjoyed an enviably wide reputation as an admirable humorist and an energetic tilter at the trans-Atlantic and other abuses that have been invading and desecrating the pure well of English undefiled.

The Bill behind which Mr Herbert was enabled, through the courtesy of Mr de la Bere who was successful in the private members' ballot, to throw the whole of his energy, ability, and powers of persuasion from November 1936 until July 23, 1937—the date on which the Lords' amendments were passed by the House of Commons without a division—was, as has been intimated, no new experiment in legislation. Bills closely similar in character had been twice passed through all their stages in the House of Lords under the fiery eloquence of the late Lord Buckmaster, assisted almost vehemently from the Woolsack by the full powers of the late Lord Birkenhead : that was all that had happened to them ; on neither occasion had they even been so much as debated in the House of Commons. On each occasion in the Lords there had been no restraint on members of the Government ; whether in or out of the Cabinet, they had been quite free to express whatever individual view each held : on each occasion the members of the episcopal benches had been present in force and, with hardly a dissident, resisted the proposed Bill. On the first occasion from its beginning, on the second occasion after amendment on the Committee stage, Lord Buckmaster had sent to the

Commons a Bill based on the recommendations of the majority of the Royal Commission which sat from 1909 to 1912. Many years, and a great international war, had intervened since the two Reports, Majority and Minority, of that Commission, but no Parliamentary action had been taken on either.

The Royal Commission, of which the only surviving member with a seat in either House of Parliament is the Archbishop of Canterbury who, as Archbishop of York, was one of the three signatories of the Minority Report, came into being in direct consequence of a motion by my father on July 15, 1909, as soon as he had ceased to be President of the Probate, Admiralty and Divorce Division and was free to act, to give jurisdiction in divorce to the County Courts. But three years earlier, on April 27, 1906, he had deliberately focused public opinion on the need for reform by stating in his judgment in the case of *Dodd v. Dodd* 'that the present state of the English law of divorce and separation is not satisfactory cannot be doubted. The law is full of inconsistencies, anomalies, and inequalities amounting almost to absurdities'—strong words from a judge on the law he had to administer. Thus, in a measure, history repeated itself: even so had Mr Justice Maule at Warwick, on April 1, 1845, by a carefully worded and extremely ironic judgment on the then law created the public opinion which enabled the Act of 1857, establishing the Divorce Court, to be placed on the Statute Book. But the interval of twelve years after Mr Justice Maule's indictment widened and widened after my father's till it stretched at length to thirty-one. In the interval, in spite of the sittings and Reports of the Royal Commission, in spite of the acknowledged scandals and the increasing public demand for reform nothing whatever was achieved, except only the placing (by the Act sponsored by Major Entwhistle) of a woman on an equality with a man, thus enabling her to obtain a divorce for adultery alone on the part of the respondent, and the subsequent extension to Commissioners of Assize of the power to try divorce cases. Neither changed the fundamental fact that under the law of England and Wales no cause was allowed except adultery—though in Scotland divorce had been allowed for more than 350 years for desertion also—or attempted to deal with the

'inconsistencies, anomalies, and inequalities' to which my father had drawn attention.

The reason for the delay is so obvious that it needs no elaboration: no Government, acting as a Government called into being for purely political aims, can possibly adopt as its own any measure which cuts right across all political party lines; and that any measure dealing in any degree with divorce does on account of the religious difficulties and divergencies that have unhappily proved to be inherent in it. It is these that it is necessary now to examine.

There are a number of passages in the New Testament in which the subject of divorce is mentioned; there are two in St Matthew's Gospel (v, 31-32 and xix, 3-12), one in St Mark's (x, 2-12), one in St Luke's (xvi, 18), and two in St Paul's Epistles, namely, 1 Corinthians (vii, 1-16) and Romans (vii, 2-3). I have given the references so that any reader may, if he or she so desires, quickly compare the passages one with another. But in general controversy has ranged round the discrepancy, actual or apparent, which exists between St Matthew and St Mark: it is needful to say 'actual or apparent', for there are those who deny that in reality there is any discrepancy whatsoever, basing that denial on the ground that the text of St Matthew is corrupt, and that the exception therein stated is a gloss. It is superfluous to set out the passages in detail: every one who has given even a brief study to the subject is aware that according to the text as it has come to us St Mark's Gospel—and in this St. Luke's is in agreement—states categorically that the marriage bond, once contracted, is indissoluble and that divorce (and remarriage) is equivalent to adultery, whereas St Matthew's Gospel introduces in both its relevant passages an exception, that is, the commission by a party to the marriage of adultery (or, as the Revised Version translates the Greek word *πορνεία*, fornication) which many have held to cover other immorality than the act of adultery. There is, therefore, dispute from the very inception of the Christian era: the one indisputable fact about the whole matter is that for nineteen hundred years theologians—and others—have differed radically as to the meaning to be placed upon these passages: take as an example—it is obviously unnecessary here to trace the controversy

throughout—the entirely divergent views expressed on the one hand by St Epiphanius (A.D. 310–403), Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus and the child of Jewish parents, who maintained that ‘the Word of God censures not’ a man, separated for whatever cause, for marrying again, ‘neither doth it declare him cast out from the Church and from life, but bears with him by reason of his infirmity,’ and on the other hand by St John Chrysostom (A.D. 347–407), who was uncompromisingly for a union dissoluble only by death, and calls attention to ‘the restraint, the inexorable bondage, the chain which compasses both parties.’ Thus early and thus irreconcilably was the issue joined, and so it has been ever since.

As a consequence there have been throughout the ages not one, not two even, but three views. Before setting them down, however, let me lay all the emphasis in my power upon the necessity for clear thought upon one point on which, to judge from the debates in Parliament, there is continual confusion, on which, it would seem, even the Archbishop of Canterbury proved himself to be confused. No one, of any school of religious observance whatsoever, has ever expressed or felt the least doubt as to what was intended by Christ to be laid down as the ideal for humanity to maintain : all are in entire harmony in holding that a union for life ‘for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health’ is the ideal—controversy only breaks out when the ideal has broken down. And the three views as to the principles which should, in that event, govern Christian people are, simply, first, that, marriage being indissoluble, the conditions, however arduous, must be endured ; secondly, that when, but only when, a spouse has been guilty of adultery divorce and remarriage is allowable ; and, thirdly, that wherever the conditions are such that the continuance of the union is a travesty of the purposes for which marriage exists, it is allowable that the parties should be no longer held together but be at liberty to rebuild their lives with other partners.

The first view is based on St Mark, the second on St Matthew—so far, in spite of the divergence, textual authority can obviously be quoted for either. The third view seems at first sight to be in conflict with both Gospels : those who hold it—and, as I have said, it has

been held by some, and those of the first theological eminence, from the beginning of the Christian era—justify their view in two ways, first, by the belief that the exception given by, or interpolated into, St Matthew's Gospel was intended to be typical rather than specific, was intended, that is, to show that there were exceptions admitted of which adultery is the obvious example—an argument which, I must confess, has never seemed to me to be of real weight, for by such could almost any words be rendered of no meaning—and, secondly, by the undeniable fact that it runs counter to the whole of the rest of Christ's teaching as recorded in the Gospels for Him to be a legislator. Continually His enemies sought to entrap Him into a declaration of policy, always He answered with a declaration of principle. Why, then, ask those who hold the third view, should His words in this matter of divorce alone be considered to lay down a binding rule rather than a guiding direction? And they receive no answer. On the principle of the ideal, I repeat, there is no conflict: on the application of the principle for humanity's 'hardness of heart' there is no concord.

One of the strangest, and in its own way one of the saddest, features about the controversy is the complete inability of the various protagonists to be logical. In the debate in the House of Commons on the Second Reading of the Bill of 1857, Mr Gladstone, after detailing the different constructions placed upon the texts—and he made them to be seven—added 'the Gospel was intended to work out a certain great and provident result and the mode of attaining this result, the most blessed and precious for mankind at large was, in the wisdom of God, not by means of commands and forms in a rigid shape, but rather by the infusion of a new spirit into the precepts of the law,' and having thus conceded the citadel, he threw the whole weight of his ability and eloquence into an endeavour to defeat the Bill. Similarly, the Roman Catholic Church, basing its doctrine upon St Mark, St Luke, and St Paul, and finding the text of St Matthew corrupt, and denying *in toto* the argument advanced by many ecclesiastical scholars that, even if it is, the very corruption shows what in the earliest Christian days was thought to be Christ's real meaning, stands four-square for the indissolubility of marriage and the consequent complete

denial of divorce ; but, as that has proved to be in this frail and sinful world the maintenance of an ideal beyond the attainment of all, in that Church the grounds in which a decree of nullity can be obtained are many, very many. So far logic holds, but there are cases where, even though a decree of nullity has been granted, where in other words there has been a declaration that no marriage between the parties in fact has taken place, nevertheless their children are held to be legitimate. That ruling is undoubtedly one of mercy, but how can it be one of logic ? The name of divorce is avoided ; but the result arrived at is indistinguishable from that of divorce.

But why, the impatient layman may ask, is it necessary to dwell upon these old religious controversies ? In part because, though they are old, they are still unhappily present in our midst, in part because so great a confusion still exists concerning them even in the minds of those who have taken prominent parts in the discussion of divorce reform, and in part because they have now brought upon the horizon of our public life an issue the full import of which does not yet seem to be realised. As regards the second reason, no clearer example could well have been given than can be found in the speech of Lord Cecil in the debate in the Lords on July 19, on the Third Reading of what for clarity's sake I will still call Mr Herbert's Bill. Lord Cecil, opposing with deep sincerity, though even he did not feel able to vote against the Bill, used these words, ' I am convinced that the people of this country believe, rightly or wrongly, that the provision with regard to divorce made in 1857 was in accordance with the Christian rule of marriage. I cannot bring myself to doubt that this cannot possibly be said of the present Bill.'

There is only one thing that can possibly be said which is undeniable, and that is that there is no agreement, and there never has been any agreement, as to what is the true Christian rule of marriage and consequentially the true Christian principles towards divorce ; and as I endeavoured to say in reply, Lord Russell of Killowen on behalf of Roman Catholics could not agree with Lord Cecil as to his first sentence nor the people of Scotland as to the second. Yet one well-known peer, writing to ' The Times ' after the final debate to explain his absence from

the division lists, declared his agreement with Lord Cecil and Lord Russell of Killowen, almost as though he had failed to appreciate that the arguments of these two were at warfare one with another.

It is not the purpose of this article to dilate upon the actual provisions of the new Act. They were set forth in every newspaper in the country, and it will be sufficient here briefly to state that they allow divorce not solely for adultery but also for desertion for at least three years, for cruelty, for incurable insanity, and finally for unnatural offences on the part of the husband : incurable insanity is strictly defined. The Act, differing from the Bill as originally introduced and from the recommendations of the Majority of the Royal Commission, does not allow divorce for habitual drunkenness or a death sentence commuted to imprisonment for life. It remedies the principal anomalies and injustices as to grounds for nullity and—the Clause I which aroused so much discussion—forbids the presentation of a petition for divorce unless three years have passed since the date of the marriage, adding, however, a proviso to the effect that a judge of the High Court may in exceptional cases of hardship or depravity allow a petition to be presented before the three years' period has elapsed. Relief is given to the conscience of the clergy. Such, in brief, is the Act which will come into force for England and Wales on January 1, 1938. It would be easy to write at length of the arguments that were advanced for and against, in particular those ranging round Clause I, and of the ill-assorted medley of reasons which on more than one occasion led those whose views were diametrically opposed to each other's to tread the division lobbies in company : but my purpose is to examine not Mr Herbert's Bill so much as the wider problems to which its passage has given rise. The above summary will suffice to show how it challenges at any rate the simple prohibition of St Mark's Gospel.

I have dealt at some length with the religious controversy since that lies at the base of all discussion of this subject, but it is time to have regard to the impatience of the layman. The whole of that age-old controversy, every conflicting view and the reasons for it are fully set out for any who wish to study it in the memorandum

prepared by my father and printed in Vol. III of the Minutes of Evidence of the Royal Commission.* The result at which he arrived has never, as far as I am aware, been challenged in religious argument: it has been silently and entirely ignored, and yet his is the only investigation of this difficult question ever conducted by one whose life was devoted to sifting evidence and delivering judgment upon that evidence. Only the two decisive sentences need be quoted here:

'If it can be properly maintained that a Divine law, if any such were in fact laid down for the guidance of human beings, and a human law arrived at as the result of human experience and passed with the object of promoting the highest morality and well-being of the people, would be in accord, such a proposition would go far to solve the problems which have perplexed the race. My conclusion is that it can and ought to be so maintained.'

We come, therefore, now logically to the examination, first, of the attitude of the State—by which I do not mean the Government—towards legislative proposals for divorce reform; secondly, of the attitude of the Church as evidenced by its official leaders; and finally, of the supremely important problem of the relation between these two entities in consequence of the divergent attitudes adopted in this last session of Parliament.

The first was a matter which necessarily engaged from the start the most earnest consideration of the Royal Commission, and I cannot do better than set out the conclusion come to and enunciated in the words of the Majority Report:

'In view of the conflict of opinion which has existed in all ages and in all branches of the Christian Church among scholars and divines equally qualified to judge, and the fact that the State must deal with all its citizens, whether Christian, nominally Christian, or non-Christian, our conclusion is that we must proceed to recommend the Legislature to act upon an unfettered consideration of what is best for the interests of the State, society, and morality, and for that of parties to suits and their families.'

This, it may be said at once, is a conclusion which has never seriously been controverted by any responsible

* Reprinted in Appendix I in 'The Life of Lord Gorell' (John Murray, 1920).

person : even those who hold themselves bound by the rule of the Church to which they belong to oppose all measures for granting, extending, or improving divorce, admit that the Legislature cannot be expected to be governed by their Church's religious views. It is the one point, besides that of the principle of the ideal already referred to, on which there is complete, even if reluctant, unanimity. Within the State, citizens governed by the law of the land, are many who do not subscribe to any form of Christian doctrine and on whom, therefore, it would be unreasonable to impose a law based upon such doctrine : the State must look with an impartial eye to what it considers in the light of experience and social needs to be in the best interests of the community at large. Not only is this undenied, but it would not give rise to such misgiving and difficulty were it not for the fact that Convocation is part of our Constitution, that we have a Church established by law and governed accordingly by the conditions of that establishment, and that we have also, as a consequence of that establishment, the leaders of the Church of England occupying a position in our Legislature which the leaders of no other Church enjoy, forming an integral part of one of our Houses of Parliament.

The position of the occupants of the episcopal benches in the House of Lords, therefore, whenever any such question as that of the alteration of our divorce laws comes before Parliament, is not an enviable one : no dual position ever is, and whatever views may be taken as to the attitude towards Mr Herbert's Bill adopted by the two Archbishops no one can feel other than respectful sympathy for them : the horns of a dilemma form inevitably an uncomfortable seat. It is not necessary to dwell further upon the divergence which was stated to exist between what was rather loosely called 'the law of the Church' and the law of the land : the law of the Church—for just so long as the Church is the Established Church of England—must follow the law of the land or be illegal. But if for the inaccurate word 'law' the words 'practice' or 'principle' be substituted, at once the sharp division that has now been declared is clear to all. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his speech on the Second Reading of Mr Herbert's Bill quoted Convocation as having recently affirmed 'as our Lord's principle and

standard of marriage a lifelong and indissoluble union for better or for worse of one man with one woman to the exclusion of all others on either side': he spoke of that as 'a Christian principle'—though as such—if it is to be applied, as he applied it, to divorce rather than to the ideal—it has, as has been shown, never been accepted universally throughout the Christian era nor up to recently was it the accepted principle of the Anglican community, which has followed St Matthew and not St Mark. However, that was the Archbishop's statement, and therefore, he explained, he could not take the responsibility of promoting a Bill which—to use his own words again—'whatever merits it may have, contains proposals which are inconsistent with the specifically Christian principle of marriage.' So much, then, for the official attitude of the chief spokesman of the Church of England: that his view of what 'the specifically Christian principle of marriage' (as applied to divorce) meant was eloquently and forcibly contested both by the Bishop of Durham and by the Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich does not alter the fact that he spoke officially as Primate, voicing the view to-day held by the great majority of Bishops and Convocation. But in addition to being Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury is necessarily a legislator: as the first, for the religious reasons he gave, he felt unable to support the Bill; as the second, reviewing the scandals at which the Bill was aimed, scandals that, as he said, were 'sufficient to cry out for some immediate reform,' he could not oppose the Bill. Responsible opinion generally has admitted that, granted his premises, such an attitude was probably inevitable. But it can hardly rest there.

We may, however, before reaching the conclusion pause briefly to contemplate one novel feature of the long controversy. In previous discussions, as has been mentioned, all the great protagonists on either side entered the lists: on this occasion battle was joined for the most part by those who could not be so described. No member of the Government, even specifically as an individual, took any part in it—except only to give dispassionate and purely legal advice and information in the House of Commons. That was singular and a deliberate avoidance of the personal responsibility that

rests on every member of either House of Parliament, but it is not significant to the degree that other silences and abstentions were. It perhaps shows that members of Cabinets are not the most responsive of people either to the public need or to what is most important in life, but we suspected that before. What was, and remains, deeply significant was the apparent apathy of the episcopal benches. During the discussions on former and similar Bills those benches were crowded, and this though most Parliamentary observers realised that the discussions were unlikely to be anything but educational: during these discussions, five days in all, on a Bill which had already passed the shoals and narrows of the House of Commons and, in the absence of material alterations, was certain to become law if passed also by the House of Lords, those benches were almost deserted. To many it seemed a peculiar irony that at the very dates on which a definite division between the practice of the Church and the law of the State was being enunciated, a conference involving the presence of notable Churchmen, in particular the Archbishop of York, on Church, Community, and State should be going on at Oxford: to many it seemed deeply significant of the future that attendance at that should be held to be of more importance than attendance in Parliament; after all, five days in eighty years—since 1857, that is—to attend upon so momentous a change could not be considered an exorbitant demand upon the time even of the busiest. The Bishop of St Albans ruggedly maintained his place and his principles: no other Bishop gave anything but widely intermittent attendance and many came not at all.

The apathy, needless to say, was apparent only. Since their leaders could not conscientiously support and were unwilling to oppose the Bill, the spiritual lords for the most part decided that it was unnecessary for them to attend merely to listen to the debates: the decision emphasized the reality of the problem that now exists. By no one was it more definitely brought into the foreground than by Lord Cecil in the speech on the Third Reading of the Bill from which I have already quoted: he used these words:

'The most reverend Primate has just said that it is incumbent upon the Church to insist upon its view of what is right

all the more because the State has taken a different view. That is, to my mind, one of the most important results of the Bill. You have here, as I see it, a clear division between the law of the Church and the law of the State, and that is recognised by the Bill. Clause 12 [the clause relieving the clergy from solemnising the marriage of any divorced person whose spouse is still living] is a clear recognition that that is so, and that the State cannot enforce on the Church its view of the marriage law. That seems to me a precedent of enormous value and enormous importance. You have now the proposition established that, although the Church cannot enforce its views on the State, neither ought the State in any matter of religion and morals to attempt to enforce its views on the Church. That is a great step towards one of the most desirable things, as I think it, that we can have—the freedom of the Church.'

So rapidly, so almost unconsciously, does public opinion change. I can well remember the discussions on the two previous serious attempts to reform the laws of divorce—that made by the late Lord Buckmaster in 1920 and that which I myself made in 1923: it was frequently said in these by those in opposition to the Bills that an issue had been raised by them far exceeding in gravity anything in the contemplation of their supporters when they were introduced—namely, the whole relation of the Established Church to the State. It was not beyond contemplation either then or earlier: it had been most earnestly contemplated from the first setting up of the Royal Commission and by no one more earnestly than by my father, who bent the whole forces of his mind to the endeavour so to compose the violence of the divergent religious views on divorce as to obviate the raising of that issue. And now it is called—and without challenge—'one of the most desirable things.' It is true that for this description the undefined word 'freedom' is used. That is beyond question a noble word, possibly the noblest that can ring in English ears: but it is never bought without price. What is the price and are those who use it ready to pay the price that may, after bitter acrimony and long discussion, be found to be demanded? That is the question which, I confess, I find myself asking now that the reverberations of the debates upon Mr Herbert's Bill are passing away into history.

Did the Archbishop of Canterbury envisage this issue and does he also think 'freedom,' 'one of the most desirable things,' independent of the question of price? Or, again, what is the view of the Archbishop of York who declared categorically of the Bill, 'I am persuaded that it ought to be passed, and for the reason that I believe it will improve rather than damage public morals,' and yet could not find it consistent with his position as an Archbishop to vote for it. Church and State, he concluded, 'have no doubt one service, namely, the service of the people,' but 'the trusts are several.'

Is not this a conclusion to divorce reform which, granted that it has 'enormous importance,' yet cannot equally be said to be 'of enormous value'? To my mind it is one which cannot be contemplated without a deep misgiving. And I am left at the end with a feeling that, amidst much which is ironical, there is one special bit of play for the spirit of irony. On the passage of the Bill Mr Herbert received, as was undeniably no less than his due, both public and private felicitations on the success which had attended his efforts at divorce reform; in addition generous tribute was paid, and by none more generously than by Mr Herbert, to the fructification of my father's work after so many barren years—and yet the bleak and storm-swept issue which emerges, which is now clearly defined and in some form or other will have to be dealt with, and at no distant date, is the grave issue that he strove so hard to avert.

GORELL.

Art. 2.—GOVERNMENT AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

MAN never loomed so large in his own eyes politically as he does to-day. It is amazing how many of the problems which posed him in the past—problems of the individual spirit, of theology, of conduct and morals, of æsthetics and manners, of craft or scholarship—have latterly been crowded out by the absorbing current question of how we shall shape our social and national organisation. It is as if, from Japan and China, Manchuria and India to Europe and America, we had become Bismarck's 'political animal' and little else. Lonely thinkers—if there be any left—feel the pull of the Time-spirit into some one of the political camps—Democratic, Fascist, Communist, Socialist, or any of their variants. Heat is daily generated in many journals and pamphlets, and light in a few books, on this one theme, of how States shall control the man and how confront the remainder of the world. The 'idol of the Tribe' never had so much incense burned before him.

It would all be so unexpected and incredible, say, to certain late Victorian and even more recent philosophers, could they return and see the new 'swarming' that is nearly everywhere going on. For in their time brains were busy upon 'the destiny and value of the finite individual,' on the subliminal consciousness, the reserves of personality, on morals and æsthetics; even our statesmen, Balfour, Morley, and Birrell among them, and Bagehot of Lombard Street, were able to keep politics in a secondary position to the humanities and philosophy. Social criticism itself was directed to specific reforms, not to the fundamental form the nation should take—liberal or dictatorial, corporative or individualist; which are precisely the points now upon which young and old dogmatise and become at times excited, so that possibly a large public in our day feels the present 'war in the Peninsula' more than their fathers did when Wellington himself was active in Spain. A war of ideas, plainly, trebles the disturbing-power of hostilities. In some unargued (and, one feels, not very logical or legitimate) fashion, people feel that near Madrid and in the Basque country a trial of strength is going forward which will decide under what general type of government *we* shall be living later. Yet

among us the lovers of democracy are so alarmed at the least approach of Fascism and lovers of order so afraid of the least tincture of Communism, that it should be clear to both that neither thing, *pur sang*, stands much chance of adoption among us, not even by force—which Britons are good at resisting and not so good at applying. For good or ill, a perfect plan brought down from a Sinai on tables of stone—a graph of the New Jerusalem vouchsafed as a revelation—could with difficulty be imposed on one-half of our people, which instinctively prefers (with any penalties attached) the freer play of personal dialectic, trial and error, debate and compromise. And such penalties there are implicit in our method. Democrats and free spirits like Mr Shaw and Mr Wells have been among the first to state them: the apparent needlessness of an Opposition to hamper Government, the electorate's concentration on men instead of measures, the lack of 'a brain trust' or 'thinking staff,' the dispersedness of our interests, our frequent cross-purposes, our lateness off the mark at times of crisis; and so forth. Even democrats, from President Roosevelt to the Premier of the hour in France and the Liberal journals in this country, admit that democracy has still to prove itself against the obvious and showy results of centralised states. The old party ties have relaxed under post-War coalitions and national governments. The floating vote was never so great, and the non-voters never so many. Feeling burns round quite other issues—this ismo or that. It is odd; just as, thirty years ago, 'advanced' thinkers were become pretty sure that most of the race was outgrowing the nationalistic phase and was too adult and critical to be regimented, controlled, and censored. And here we surprisingly are with the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World, rather further off than when the poet coined the hopeful phrases; the League a Cinderella; Britain a worried, honest broker; America aloof or engrossed in labour troubles; armaments booming; propaganda for rival systems an incessant noise in the ears.

It is symptomatic that, for change from this, mankind takes even its recreations communally—from 'hiking' in companies and community-singing to sporting crowds and promenade concerts. Things like poetry, which demand solitariness either for its creation or appreciation, are at a

discount. Writers turn to the theatre and novel, and half of what they do in these media is journalism, topical, subconscious propaganda and social criticism. Religion, too, which requires a certain equipoise, *self*-possession, and non-saturation with 'the world,' admittedly feels the draught. There has been, to our loss, a flight from the transcendental; and no 'recall to religion' will receive its due until the stormy secular waters subside sufficiently. The current air of humanism and naturalism is unfriendly to these flowers of the spirit.

Certain facts should induce in Britons a proper humility and perspective when they express annoyance or surprise at political excesses in other lands to-day. England was the incubator of many of these ideologies. We had our Fascism (far cruder and less humane than certain types abroad) under Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell: 'the English Terror,' Green called it; while Erasmus said men 'felt as if a scorpion lay sleeping under every stone.' Not only was thought made treason, but men were obliged to reveal their thoughts on pain of their very silence being punished as treason; while their words were tortured into admissions. That was our Ogpu. And when we observe another government laying about it among religious confessions, let us recall the Tudor knack of tuning the pulpits, and the later wholesale ejections and purges, and the laws against recusants. That we have passed these stages of ferocity need not mean that others may not have to pass, by delayed paths, through a similar experimental evolution. Under the Commonwealth (so self-styled) we tried the reign of the saints (again, self-elected); and decided that we did not like it. We, not revolutionary France or Bolshevik Russia, were the pioneers in Regicide. We have furnished to revolutions abroad (whether of the Right or the Left) some of their most mordant weapons. There was Hobbes' 'Leviathan,' with its chilling empiric version of human society as 'an artificial Man of greater stature and strength than the natural, for whose protection it was intended,' and requiring an absolute single ruler. There was Bernard Mandeville's influential 'Fable of the Bees,' with its very earthy view of human association. There were the oligarchic and caucus administrations of the Queen Anne period, with their rotten boroughs: a scene as cynical

surely as anything to which we can point anywhere in our modern world—Tammany without Tammany's robustious and frank vulgarity and publicity. Tom Paine's 'Rights of Man' and 'Age of Reason' and Hume's 'Principles of Human Nature'—no less—were somehow got into a book; and seed was sown whose germination none could know. We produced professional freethinkers, Toland and others, and cultivated sceptics, Gibbon, for example, whose influence was immense—elsewhere; England as a whole was steadied by routine, habit, and a providential non-inflammability which looked like stupidity. As Voltaire had borrowed English ideas on his visit here, as Montesquieu was in debt to us for many pages of his 'Spirit of Law,' so French revolutionary leaders at first pointed to London as the home of freedom. The compliments soon alarmed England, which thereupon side-stepped vigorously to the Right. When we went to war indeed with revolutionary France, Carlyle notes with dreadful curtness: 'England cast out the Ambassador, England declares war—being shocked principally, it would seem, by the condition of the River Scheldt.' Ideas did not find us combustible. Diderot and Börne and the Encyclopædists nevertheless owed considerably to ideas born in this island—and neglected. Our subversive philosophies were kept for export mainly. Later we gave others the equivocal blessings of parliamentarism, machinery, and economics of the Manchester school; but these did not always leap the barrier of the spiritual Customs.

Yet Marx and Lenin, two terrific phenomena for the modern world, were both shaped mentally, during their exiles, in the Reading Room of the British Museum. These two, out of all the thousands in that grey rotunda, carried things to their extreme conclusions. It seems an unlikely cradle for such monstrous growths as Marxism and Bolshevism; as unlikely as that the signing-on of Darwin on the 'Beagle' at the last hour should have initiated inquiries which later transformed biological science in this and other countries, or that such a prosaic figure should set the world thinking in evolutionary terms.

The British thus far have not been so susceptible as many other peoples to the extreme force of ideas and movements (originating with us or not) which galvanise

or devastate or prostrate less protected or more intellectual temperaments. We have not been patients but 'carriers,' in medical language. But signs are not wanting that this immunity is drawing to a close. Passions beside which former party rivalries were good-humoured banter are roused in our cities by the opposed political clans, which are stronger both numerically and in will-power as well as vociferation than the polite journals and statesmen of the Centre suppose or wish to suppose. The noteworthy fact is that, at any time of raised temperature, the *via media* is unpopular; the moderate man or party seems insipid and colourless; much as the old, staid Liberal party failed to satisfy the need of young reformers for 'drive,' and much as the Tory of Scott's day or Thackeray's recognised the definition 'Toryism is enjoyment,' as no Conservative would to-day. To-day the Conservative (under the alias 'National Government') is a Whig or a democrat passing tempered, quasi-socialist legislation. He is not in the least like the festive, stay-put Tory of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He is as earnest and anxious about many things as any trade-union Labour candidate; and the back streets vote him in expecting much the same goods to be delivered. But there is a compact and increasing body of people who are demanding something more dynamic and dæmonic. Perhaps they will get both, and in a measure more than they want. Logic and the Idea have re-entered British political life by side-doors. Blacks and reds both have great numbers of sympathisers who have not yet shown their hand, but may do so when adequate occasion arises. Propaganda by both is in full blast; indeed, they are perhaps the only people who *are* conducting actively the industry of convert-making. And both have Continental affinities and affiliations; they are linked on to world movements and can appeal to feeling in foreign as well as home affairs. The churches and churchmen are disposed also to take sides, moved by what is happening in regard to religion in other countries. It is a new thing that workers by the thousand, from a dozen countries, should volunteer for military service on one side or the other in Spain; and that almost daily high words are reached in the House of Commons on the question of withdrawal, frontier observers, belligerent rights, and recognition.

In this atmosphere, we are far away from the old pragmatic frame of mind which said :

' For forms of government let fools contest ;
Whate'er is best administered is best.'

The couplet begs the question of which form of government gives an administrator the best chance ; for organisation does signify, and one machine functions more efficiently than another. The zealots claim absolute merit for their preferred State-ideal. And yet very few have stopped to inquire just what it is that governments exist to produce. Security, says one, or dominance ; peace, another intones. A third declares : social reform and economic comfort, of course. On these lines no one has beaten Jeremy Bentham's 'the greatest good of the greatest number' : albeit he forgot to define the operative word good, and thus lost a wonderful chance. Surely we can get nearer to it than this. Surely what governments *ought* to exist for is to produce—not primarily regiments, organisation, industries, instruments of offence and defence, a favourable trade balance, a big bullion reserve, and dividend-yielding loans ; not so much these means, but rather the end—naturally and fully developed individuals ; character, happiness, freedom based on personal self-government. To these values over-government and over-discipline are as fatal as the absence of control. Sparta produces armies, shock-tactics, victory : and is barren and forgotten. Greece produces Socrates, Æschylus, Plato, Sophocles—in fact, what did she not produce ? In milder form, that contrast is repeated in the history of other national regimes since. The mind and soul of man must have room to grow in. Too much guidance, handling, indoctrination, and suggestion paralyse and sterilise it. The enormous, intricate, and costly apparatus of compulsory universal education has not made the average Briton a whit shrewder, finer, or better informed upon what it imports him to know than the folk heard talking in the ' Canterbury Tales,' ' Gammer Gurton's Needle,' or the plebeian scenes of Shakespeare's ' Henry ' plays. The general run of us are not their superiors at crafts, games, singing, ploughing, food-raising, doctoring ourselves ; nor can we give them any points in reverence, perseverance, high spirits, physical tenacity, good memory, and summary

character-reading. Nay, the very plethora of machinery—primary and secondary schools, clinics, radio, the cinema, photography, the post, the newspaper, the elaborate social services—seem to have subdued the individual, and reduced the spontaneous part he should play in all this. He is stunned and dulled actually by the wonders around him, and the nerve of curiosity ceases to respond. And the social worker and reformer who pauses occasionally to reflect must wonder, Is not too much being done to replace effort of their own? Not this way do we produce either geniuses or strong character, but more often a surplus of information and stimuli.

That is one easily accessible instance of means over-laying the end. The best art is that which attains its end with the minimum of means; and this is true also of the best life. The man who has absorbed genuinely six great books is prodigiously more educated than another who has cultivated himself into a museum of chatty ignorances on two newspapers a day, a novel a week all his life, and perpetual talk in train and café. Similarly, is not the best form of human administration, on any long view, that which encourages the individual wisely to fulfil himself—the deeper self before the superficial—and does not weaken the mainspring of the mind by making effort superfluous? Are we, with all our aids and appurtenances, such good ‘self-starters’ as we were a few generations ago? And is not the lad at school who resists the machinations of the pedagogue often the lad who makes his mark in life later? The truth is, he has not been fatigued, spoon-fed, or enfeebled. Probably many of us are too influenced and too man-handled ever to work out our own salvation. ‘Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers,’ said the poet, adding, with something like clairvoyance: ‘And the individual withers, and the world is more and more.’ The inspected, docketed, State-run life, then, is poor, whatever ultimate standard we take. Bureaucracy is neither vital nor spiritual in its results. After all, plants and animals—of whom man is cousin—need air, space, and scope in which to flourish and reach their stature. Endeavour and adventure are part of our birthright, and it is possible to school and govern and ‘cram’ the mother-wit out of us. We possibly need a holiday from legislation—at least from the legislation

which is interference or a substitute for personal volition.

All overcrowding, all running into groups for every conceivable purpose, all exaggerations of collectivism supplant the true personality—personality, which is the only rational and worthwhile explanation of the whole mundane movement. Some privacy and solitude are imperative for its health and development. General culture, as well as religion, has always demanded this. Nothing great is thought, done, or produced in crowds. The characteristic crowd art—oratory—has been called the harlot of the arts. The more emphatic the crowd-sentiment, the lower the level of reasoning, judging, and fine feeling. As one of a mass-meeting we meekly take from a rhetorical speaker statements which at the fireside we should expose with humour and irony. Angers and tensions are stimulated on matters political which really ask years of cool investigation, taking us into biology, psychology, theology, and other departments of knowledge. Yet to the accepted haranguers and leaders 'politics' is an affair of simple dogmatic and highly coloured statement, needing none of the drudgery of inquiry. And these unexamined 'isms are even becoming a substitute for religion, a hot crusading faith, a new thaumaturgy, an *ersatz* church. The spectacle recalls Swift's battle of the Big-endians and the Little-endians. The nuisance is that it is robbing many of the life of reverie, detachment, religion, the humanities—and good temper. Bergson's definition of the world, 'a vale of soul-making,' should apply to any well-run state.

There is admittedly too much ego just now in man's Cosmos, but the ego is not the individual spirit—it is the state, the community, tribe, or empire. The questions of rule, executive, legislation, and combination are important, but have we forgotten Johnson's profound remark that, of all the ills which mankind endure, how few are those which laws can cure? It used to be a truism, not long ago, that you cannot make men good by decree or Act of Parliament. There are thousands of stern enthusiasts among us to-day who believe apparently that we can; that a different kind of social alignment, a stronger governing body, would do all. Nevertheless, they are probably wrong. This excessive attention to

externals may be an illusion, after all. Character is still the root of the matter ; under whatever form of government we live. The best constitution devisable must disappoint or founder if the men who work it are shifty or lazy or anywise inefficient. A poorer constitution would still make a better show if worked by men of virtue, sense, and public spirit. It is the human instrument who signifies all the time. From the judge in the High Court to the inspector of taxes (or of anything else), the policeman, and the local council officials, much is left by the written code to the temper and interpretation of the official. Show us a state in which the predominating character of civil servants and the people is just, kindly, patient, and practical ; and really it matters comparatively little then what classification applies to their brand of government—it will work, it will produce considerable contentment, it will let individuals grow. Again, show us a country in which the majority of the people can intelligently choose for themselves their reading matter, leisure occupation, opinions, and pastimes without surveillance or veiled coercion, and we know by the same token that a moral and human value is there for which drilled unity or formidable hitting-power is no substitute. The sentient, reasoning soul is the true entity and reality, by comparison with which the configuration of a state is a provisional, subservient thing, secondary and utilitarian. Consider the principal human and spiritual values which can coexist indifferently with almost any type of secular administration (except, no doubt, atheistic communism, revolution, or varieties of martial law and suppression in times of panic). For instance, Christianity has functioned true to type under monarchy, republicanism, mild forms of socialism, conservatism, oligarchy, feudalism, bureaucracy, and can live alongside the mediæval guild or the modern trade union. Again, the family and its loyalties have contrived to flourish amid them all. The consolations of love and friendship exist independently of the fashion of government of the day. All the world of eye and ear, the delights of nature and the seasons, do not wait upon the passing expedients of communal man. The comforts of literature and art are ours for the taking no matter who is in office. Under what incredibly different governments have the great ones of the world lived, and

the great things been done! Politically, what in common had Homer, Sophocles, Virgil, Dante, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Goethe, Cervantes, Hugo, Wordsworth? Genius and intellect are not wholly the prisoner of their period and parish. 'Lines, the birth of some chance morning or evening at an Ionian festival or among the Sabine hills,' speak to us immortally in 1937 in 'streaming London's central roar.' Perhaps this is what is meant dimly when people, rather hastily and unwisely, dismiss 'Politics' as irritating or of secondary importance; which politics certainly is not, in its greater sense. The amount of self-fulfilment possible to human nature regardless of the colour and style of the men in power will be realised afresh when the present fevers of nationalist self-assertion have served their inscrutable purpose and have passed away. Man is not simply an economic, political, militant creature; he is a religious being, a thinker, a person with personal relations, a soul with affinities out of time and space. His claims as a spirit cannot with safety be relegated to the appendix of a state's constitution, any more than Christianity and its ideas can be content to be a dumb waiter on events which it is forbidden to share in shaping—the chief maker of European culture cannot be quietly disfranchised.

After a sufficiently long and severe phase of the present mundane, earth-bound policies—'Real' Politik—men will tire of their closeness and fragmentariness and feel again the old unquenchable nostalgia for the lost horizons. The talent of communion with the supra-sensible may be atrophied awhile, but it always has its resurgence, for it is an organic part of us. I speak of religion in its widest inclusive senses, comprehending nature-mysticism, philosophic speculation, the poet's realisation of the mystery and tears in mortal things, ideality, chivalrous love, as well as of the tremendous mysteries of the historic Faith; of the emotions elicited by the Himalayas or the sea, by the 'Divine Comedy' or 'Paradise Lost,' by 'Prometheus' or 'The Prelude,' by Beethoven, Bach, or Brahms, as well as of the stillness of the country church and man's Sabbath glimpse of the incommensurable. Suppose one *could* have these under otherwise exasperating forms of Nazismo or Bolshevism, who would not accept those penalties rather than contemplate missing these goods under some other-

wise unfriendly temporal organisation? Man does not live by bread alone, nor politics and administration alone. Even here, and whether he sees and admits it or not, he is a candidate for the eternal, a god in the making, 'a sojourner and a stranger' with no continuing city; and his half-way houses and transient shelters (little essays toward an earthly city of God) necessarily crumble away. These state-forms are as fluid as cloud shapes, as it is. They hardly survive, intact, their founders; they have to make terms with environing necessity, with human nature, with time and experiment. Where is Goethe's Germany? Or Bismarck's? Where Hitler's will be in sixty years. And so also with Russia, Italy, Poland, and the rest. Not one of them is exempt from change and evolution.

The infinite and disinterested element in us will not be permanently denied. As Charles Lamb's schoolmaster was 'boy-sick, sick of perpetual Boy,' so the thinking part of mankind will in time tire of the incessant solicitude about man and his material conformations for defence, attack, gain, physical comfort, or sense-gratification; he will be 'man-sick, sick of perpetual Man.' An Ariel imprisoned in the knotty tree, he will crave some Prospero to 'make gape the pine to let me out.' For

' Out of darkness come the hands
That reach through nature, moulding man.
A warmth within the breast will melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And like a man in wrath the heart
Stands up and answers, " I have felt." '

He remembers his birth and true *patria*, 'and all the secret of the spring moves in the chambers of the blood.' The poet is right: the World is too much with us. Just now it is more seductive than flesh or devil; for everything in print or talk conspires to make even the conscientious believe that little else matters but the immediate diurnal question. Yet man is often best served by those who withdraw from man to their pristine sources for refreshment and power. Exclusive saturation with human affairs however significant, is not healthy. Man is not the final nor full environment for man. None can say of *man* that 'in him we live and move and have our being' nor that 'ye are complete in him.' It is mischievous as biology. The human crop will wither without winds

from the Unseen. 'There is surely a piece of divinity in us, something that was before the elements, and owes no homage unto the sun.' The human drama is very close to us and loud; the arc lamps that light it hide the fixed stars and the mountain ranges of the spiritual world. Religion, the Mary, is invited to be the bustling Martha; the thirst for the supernal to become a merely intra-human phenomenon. The tendency is assisted by closer communications, speeded-up events, the increase of building, noise, and generally the *means* of existence: it is hard to shut off the radio, lay by the newspaper, avoid the cinema, retire from controversy or the sound of opinion, and let spirit meet Spirit, realising human littleness and greatness within the mystery and mastery of the eternal (a paradox that exhilarates). It is not in the world outside ourselves that we shall discover fundamental reality. When men say 'Lo, here,' and 'Lo, there,' it is wisdom to hear the old advice: 'Go not out. For the kingdom is within you.' Men must be changed inside before they can make any salutary, profound change in their outward living. Too many are engrossed in trying to re-form others, rather than looking to their own personal code. Salvation is not wholesale. Newman was right—deliverance is wrought not by the many but by the few; not by the crowds, but by and in persons. One welcomes Mr Priestley's recent remark, 'Personal life is sacred, and it is what the machinery of life exists to produce.'

Keyserling thinks that 'modern humanity has destroyed the forms whose development made our ancestors profound, and since it has not developed new ones to replace the old, men are becoming more superficial and more evil from year to year.' The diagnosis is a sweeping one. The forms are not destroyed. They are in the Church, in the classics, and in art; and contact may be made with them by any educated man at any hour. Lord Baldwin recently said, 'No State that ever was is worthy of a free man's worship,' and certainly the peoples who have deified the State—old Babylon, Egypt, Sparta, Rome—have lacked the resilience and the soft play of life. The half-gods had to go. Man is finite in one sense; but he must breathe the infinite. And where there is no sense of the Beyond, in a few generations the people perish.

W. J. BLYTON.

Art. 3.—THE PROBLEM OF THE CHOUGH.

FAILURE may not be as attractive as success, but it is frequently more romantic ; and among wild creatures the few survivors of a rapidly declining race acquire a melancholy distinction which is not always desirable. This is particularly true of the once abundant chough (*Pyrrhonorax graculus*), one of the most beautiful members of the extensive crow family, a bird which now appears to be making its last stand against total extinction, so far as Great Britain is concerned. Essentially a cliff-dweller this species was comparatively numerous, though locally distributed, along the western seaboard half a century ago. Now it is represented upon the entire Cornish peninsula by one or two isolated pairs ; and the hope of a definite recovery seems remote at best. Wales is more fortunate as yet, but even upon this wild and favoured coast-line one finds the same regrettable tale of decrease. That the decline is largely natural renders the position the less hopeful. Man has certainly hastened the chough along the down-hill path, for within recent years the collector has reached far with an insatiable hand.

It must always be remembered, however, that the scarcity of a species is usually the cause rather than the effect of persecution of this particular type. The rarer the bird, the greater the demand for its eggs or its unfortunate body ; and the necessity for protection is seldom recognised until too late. In Wales the country people are now anxious to preserve the chough as a valuable asset to the coast, but, unfortunately, they were not always so scrupulous. An aged Welshman who claims the longest acquaintance with the Pembrokeshire coast-line recently boasted of having shot hundreds of ' red-billed crows ' in the good old days. When my wife inquired why he killed the birds, he replied, ' For fun, ma'am, and for nothing else,' a resolute old chin, sturdily out-thrust, imparting point, figurative and literal, to the pronouncement. The same hoary Cymrian's outlook upon affairs in general is scarcely progressive. He regards the cinema as ' a curse,' and in the matter of local avifauna expresses profound regret that ' everything is protected nowadays.' In this respect, however, he admits that conditions are not as deplorable—from his point of view—as they might be.

To the suggestion that means of evading the wild life preservation laws are usually found, his answer was 'Oh dear, yes,' evidently deriving considerable consolation from the ineffectiveness of existing legislation.

The chough is no longer shot 'for fun,' nor harried with trained falcons as in the days of Helôise and Abélard, although he is sometimes killed even now for profit or interest. His worst enemy is still the egg-thief, the man equipped with bar and rope, who once again has become too active upon the British cliffs, aided by the rapidity of modern transport and the numerous sources of information at his disposal. It is now so easy for the despoiler to discover the haunts of any rare species, that there is little hope of preserving secrecy upon such matters. Indeed, publicity sometimes proves helpful, since people who are content to study the birds from a discreet distance automatically become amateur wardens when robbery is threatened. This advantage, however, is frequently offset by excessive zeal upon the part of photographers, who are liable to scatter the broods too early. I have known young choughs taken from their nest by a particularly daring climber to enable the camera-man—less cool of head—to obtain his picture. They were replaced, certainly, but such disturbance is most undesirable.

A chough's nest cannot always be reached even with a rope. At times it is built deep in a cavern, one site near St David's, used for many years, being characteristic. It is a huge natural arch, supported by massive pillars of rock from the base of which the tide never recedes, rendering the place unassailable from either cliff-top or shore. Yet the birds have forsaken it, or those which originally occupied it have gone the way of their kind and their descendants prefer another stronghold. But even caves are not secure against the plunderer. When a rope from above falls wide of the objective, a bold climber will work up a swinging motion which eventually carries him into the cavern, when, by grasping a ledge of rock and so steadying himself, he sometimes succeeds in accomplishing his purpose. Many nests were reached in this way when they were more plentiful, a clutch of five eggs realising two pounds even in those days. Judging from old stories, referring as a rule to some conveniently remote date, rope-work on the cliffs was most active, amounting almost

to an industry in South Wales about the close of the last century. All considered, therefore, it is scarcely surprising that the chough suffered numerically.

The problem becomes less simple when one reflects that other species have survived and in certain outstanding instances actually multiplied under the most intensive persecution. Even allowing for the utmost that man could accomplish—and he has done his worst—the chough should not have failed so completely in the struggle. So inaccessible were many of the crags upon which the bird nested that strongholds into which no human hand penetrated nor eye ever looked must have been the rule rather than the exception. It should also be realised that the chough does nothing to incur the hostility of man. Though tolerably omnivorous, like all the *Corvidæ*, he is by disposition too diffident ever to be regarded as predatory. Unlike his next of kin, the jackdaw, he does not hang round the hencoops to claim a share of the maize or meal—a common cause of friction between daws and poultry-keepers. His redness in tooth and claw is, by curious coincidence, purely literal; nor will he be detected hovering about within suspicious proximity of a sickly ewe or lamb, after the manner of the raven, carrion crow, or magpie. In his feeding habits he most closely resembles the rook, but was never addicted to descending in voracious flocks upon the newly sown or sprouting grain. He is one of the most remarkable members of his family in that he combines the habits of two or three species without evincing their reprehensible tendencies. He possesses the virtues of many, the vices of none. In his case, however, good behaviour has not brought its own reward. The bird seems unfit for the world's rough usage, and his fate clearly illustrates that, so far as wild life is concerned, the meek cannot inherit the earth.

Even in this respect it is strange that his retiring habits have not better enabled the chough to escape undesired attention. Few birds are more difficult to observe. Excepting during the breeding season one may spend weeks or months upon a chough-haunted coast without obtaining more than fleeting glimpses of the shy wild creature as it flits to and fro upon its furtive avocations. The harsh, protesting cry sounds suddenly from some crag or inlet; there is a glint of blue-black wings; the

gleam of a long red beak in the sunlight and red legs tucked tightly against a dark body, and the bird—or birds, for there are always two—may be seen winging away across a bay in line for some distant cliff among whose recesses they disappear and are seldom seen again.

That is the chough when not occupied with domestic duties. To obtain more than casual glimpses long study and endless patience are essential, and by such means alone can one piece together the story of his life. So far as personal observation can discover, he is a bird of the crags and cliff-tops rather than of the beaches. One seldom sees him hopping along the tide-line, nor does he hunt the mussel-beds and seaweed expanses as persistently as the carrion crow. I have frequently watched a pair foraging upon short turf, but the bird is particularly fond of loose earth, and for this reason usually seeks his food upon broken parts of the cliff, such as cavities formed by landslides or sandy slopes which have been well excavated by rabbits. His ideal haunt is a cliff-top scored by ancient fortifications—singularly appropriate, since in the folk-lore of the West, King Arthur's cloak descended upon the chough, assigning to him the defence of Britain's shores. Unimaginative as the selection of this gentle bird for such a rôle may seem, it is none the less interesting, serving to illustrate how characteristic a feature of the coast the chough must have been in the age when fable had its birth.

Serenely unaware of this romantic connection, the peace-loving chough of to-day evinces a marked predilection for these monumental remains of a warlike past. At the moment I know of three pairs each established upon a separate 'castle' of this description, all within a dozen miles of each other. In the character of defender, however, the bird falls sadly behind the sturdy warriors who constructed the ramparts. I have never seen him at loggerheads with anything except a buzzard, which a pair of choughs will attack resolutely. This is curious, for a buzzard is the least aggressive of all the *raptores*, yet for this very reason, perhaps—since it seldom retaliates—it is assailed wherever it appears, even by birds which take no exception to far more dangerous winged bandits. Anyhow, inconsistent as it may seem, the buzzard is the

one bird against which choughs make any attempt to defend their citadel.

This somewhat unreasonable policy was pointedly adopted by a pair which occupied the ridged summit of an old Danish encampment fronting St Bride's Bay. The nest was built near the mouth of a narrow, precipitous ravine up and down which herring gulls drifted in an unending slow procession; the sinister croak of a raven frequently sounded from the adjoining crags; prowling carrion crows haunted the vicinity; jackdaws were everywhere in evidence, yet none of these dangerous neighbours excited the slightest apprehension. Even when the nest contained callow young, the parent birds attended to their duties as unconcernedly as though no shadow more ominous than that of a rock-pipit ever fell across the cliff's face. Only when the buzzard appeared, cruising in wide circles over land and sea, was the alarm note heard, to be followed by direct action as soon as the broad-winged suspect approached within a prescribed distance.

That same wild headland, locally known by a name which, interpreted into English, means The Mound above the Wave, has been a regular breeding-place for choughs as long as history or tradition records, and never has this romantic bird figured in a setting more picturesque. During early summer this remote extremity of Wales, with its purple cliffs continuously washed by the enchanted sea, acquires the colours of a perpetual sunset. The all-prevailing thrift clouds its wind-rippled summit like pink-tinted snow. The gorse clumps which now mount guard upon the well-defined fortifications contribute their quota of gold, fragrant under the sun, ghostly in the moonlight. Against the dark greenery of the heather banks foxgloves are grouped in decorative array, while inland stretch barren pastures, brightly red with sorrel and scarlet pimpernel. Overhead sounds the curlew's trill, mingling harmoniously with the wild but less musical plaint of the lapwing and the ceaseless outcry of the ever-suspicious oyster-catchers along the tide-line.

For many years choughs have made their nest in a crevice upon a sheer wall of rock overhanging the breakers. It is a fearsome place, inaccessible and invisible from above, unless one possesses nerves insensible to giddiness.

The precipice is buttressed by natural wedges of rock, sloping seaward like huge breakwaters, and upon one of these, carved by the wear of time into rough steps or terraces, the choughs spent a considerable time, as it overlooked the nesting-hole and formed a convenient perch. There they might often be seen, particularly in late evening, when the hungry little mouths had been filled, like human parents enjoying a well-earned period of leisure. Very effective they looked as they stood or squatted side by side, their long bills touching or caressing in a manner which could only be described as confidential, their jet black forms conspicuous against the red sandstone or the creamy foam far below. Earlier in the day they used this ledge mainly as a halting-place when coming or going, pausing for a few moments to clean their beaks upon the scanty herbage after feeding the young, or using the place as a depository for food brought, prior to selecting the most suitable edibles and discarding anything which failed to pass standard.

The chough usually feeds its young at intervals of about half an hour, in which respect it differs from the jackdaw, which is seldom absent for many minutes, coming and going almost continuously. It also forages much farther afield; and while the jackdaw is content with anything that the immediate neighbourhood can provide, the chough adheres to some specially selected feeding-ground, which may be two or three miles away from the nest. I have frequently watched its regular return to some prescribed distant point, to reach which it invariably follows its own chosen route. These particular birds had cultivated the quaint habit of diverging slightly from their direct course, circling once over a certain little grassy clearing on a heather-slope, then proceeding on their way. This formality was seldom omitted, even when family duties necessitated haste. Once when the male bird had preceded the hen by a minute or two, he alighted in the clearing, waited until the dark little silhouette of his mate appeared upon the skyline, rejoined her in air, then both punctiliously described the ceremonial circle before resuming their flight together. A pair of choughs almost invariably forage in company. Indeed, one is seldom without the other. This applies also to jackdaws, but the latter are

not so essentially inseparable. If the hen chough enters a hole, as she sometimes does, when grub-hunting on the cliff's face, the male mounts guard outside and waits for her, thus at times deluding a watcher into the belief that he has discovered a nest. Obsessed with this erroneous idea, I once watched a hole for several days before discovering that the birds were quite as interested in numerous other crevices in the vicinity, and that actually they had no nest. At least, it was undiscoverable or, like the best gold, always seemed to be 'farther on.'

Choughs are never accommodating to observers. The custodians of The Mound above the Wave were singularly adept at concealing their movements, even when busily feeding the nestlings. The skill with which they kept out of sight upon their return flights to the nest was almost uncanny. No matter how carefully one selected a hiding-place, they seemed able to detect it while remaining themselves invisible. Flying high or low, as best suited their purpose, they contrived to select hidden ways, and more often than not one was unaware of their return until they had again embarked upon the outward journey. When quitting the nest, they invariably took the same line, passing along the precipitous ravine used by the herring gulls, over the fortifications and a wide bay beyond. They made no attempt to conceal these outward flights, crossing within a few yards of an observer whose presence they never failed to acknowledge with a defiant screech—usually the first indication that their errand had been once more accomplished. Observation that was unsuspected by the birds seemed possible from one point only. This was a rocky ledge on the seaward side and *below* the level of the nest. They did not appear to apprehend danger from sea or shore, and though the place lay exposed to view except for a few jutting rocks, they were either unaware of or indifferent to espionage from that quarter.

It was almost inevitable that the birds should display themselves to the best advantage at times when atmospheric conditions made observation most difficult. During wild weather they seldom ranged so far afield, confining their activities mainly to the old heather-draped trenches where the rabbit-burrows provided abundant loose earth in which to scratch; and when high winds or whirling

spindrift swept the shore, obscuring visibility, and rendering the 'watch-tower' among the rocks untenable, the choughs were usually at home upon their favourite terrace. Neither the drenching spray nor the storm-wind which rumbled their plumage worried them in the least, and they evidently preferred their tempestuous perch to any other.

Although they fed their young at more or less regular intervals, each day there were inactive periods which were not always spent in the vicinity of the nest. Indeed, they sometimes absented themselves for hours, and these relaxations of duty bore no relation to the clock. During one week they might be exceedingly busy until midday then nowhere in evidence throughout the afternoon. The following week the order would be reversed. It was noticeable that their activities upon these occasions corresponded with those of the rooks and jackdaws which were feeding upon the fields at the same time. The long absences also coincided with low tide, but whether any connection exists between tides and the movements of birds, apart from those which actually feed upon the shore, is a big question. The country people almost unanimously adhere to the belief that all springs within a reasonable distance of the sea respond to its ebb and flow, and if this is the case, a corresponding influence might possibly extend to the insect life of the marshy lands upon which so many birds depend for their food supply.

Unlike the jackdaw, which returns to its nest with a crammed beak, the chough seldom visibly carries food, this being probably regurgitated, after the manner of most birds who collect it in minute quantities or at a distance. The species is for the most part insectivorous, as suggested by the long beak, which is neither merely decorative nor whimsical. It fulfils a natural purpose and must be most serviceable for probing in soft soil or amongst herbage. It also affords the bird a longer reach, which is decidedly useful when he is searching for grubs on the brink of a precipice. I have seen him suspended like a fly, head downwards, his red legs firmly planted in a tuft of thrift overhanging a chasm, while his extended beak explored the exposed roots. He feeds a great deal amongst thrift, from which plant, indeed, he is almost as inseparable as the red grouse from heather. Bird of the

precipices as he is, one sometimes wonders how the young choughs contrive to reach the cliff-tops, so cavernous and overhung are many of the places upon which their insecure feet must first alight after leaving the nest. This is a critical stage, during which a certain number must perish. A fledgling's uncertain wings frequently carry him to heights or depths which may prove equally dangerous. When studying choughs, I recently watched the laborious ascent of one youngster, who, distrusting his ability in air, treated the cliff's face much as a puppy might a flight of steps. He used his wings merely as a seal upon shore uses his flippers, to facilitate climbing operations, and so scrambled from one rocky stair to another, his action degenerating into an undignified crawl when the ascent became particularly steep or dangerous.

As a species, the chough is strong on the wing, his high flights and aerial circlings more closely approaching those of the raven than the performances of his nearer relatives. In air he can scarcely be confused with the jackdaw even when the red beak and legs are indiscernible. His wings are more pointed, his silhouette more slender, his graceful poise possessing the indefinable distinction of a feathered aristocrat. This applies equally to his cry, although the distinguishing characteristics are more easily recognised when heard than described. A jackdaw's call might be mistaken for that of a chough, but never a chough's note for that of a jackdaw. Even a novice can usually detect it without difficulty. The cry that issues from the red beak is pitched upon a higher key, more resembling the first efforts of a young jackdaw or rook, and is at times almost querulous, as though the bird were protesting against its treatment at the hands of fate. Speaking from personal observation, the chough is not sociably disposed towards his more plebeian neighbours. I have, indeed, seen him discoursing among the jackdaws, his beak agape while he delivered his oratory, but as a rule he holds little intercourse with them. Upon the cliffs, even as elsewhere, there are 'many mansions,' and the chough, while remaining at peace with everybody, lives his own life as Nature intended. His way lies apart from all his kin, whether black or grey-masked, and an old writer was probably correct in asserting that choughs fed at one end of a field and rooks or daws at the other.

One cannot but protest against the conventional theory that jackdaws are mainly responsible for the chough's decline. In an old volume of the 'Naturalist' dated as long ago as 1852, I find the same idea discussed and refuted. The charge had then been brought by an ornithologist who had studied choughs on Caldy Island and 'procured several specimens.' The ironical character of an accusation from such a source renders the obvious comment superfluous. One might, however, plead for a little more originality in all such matters, and for more open-minded consideration. Admittedly, the jackdaw is not the most attractive of birds, but he is no more to blame for the chough's decrease than is the blackbird for the comparative scarcity of the song-thrush—a circumstance which latterly has given rise to considerable discussion in the West Country. That in the former case, one species is rare and the other abundant is sufficient to account for the supposition. As a rule, the jackdaw is not charged with waging actual war upon the chough or even with pilfering its eggs. It is merely said to appropriate available nesting-holes, so crowding out the less tenacious bird. Since every other species continues to find room, however, including birds as gentle as the rock-dove, it does not seem quite reasonable to assume that the chough alone finds competition too keen in this respect. All considered, it seems sufficiently clear that the decline of the species cannot be attributed to any specific cause or agency, but rather to an accumulation of circumstances, each insufficient in itself, yet contributory.

With the chough, as with most rare birds, one notices a somewhat remarkable circumstance. In the few localities where the species persists, its numerical status remains much the same over a considerable period of years. Speaking for the western coasts generally, there are no longer any 'colonies.' The race is represented by pairs established at varying intervals, and even the successful rearing of a brood is not followed by a corresponding increase. The following season, each locality produces one pair as before. Far or near, there is no sign of the descendants, or if these at times inherit a site in the natural order of events, there is nothing to indicate the change. In 1936 I located five pairs along a twelve-mile expanse of Welsh coast-line. The present summer of

1937 produced a corresponding number established upon the same cliffs, where in each case the presence of the birds was taken for granted. There were no indications of a fresh nesting-place, and—a significant circumstance—nobody conversant with the avifauna of the district expected to find one. The question remains as to what becomes of the brood, or, if any survive, why the perennial balance remains unchanged. Indeed, several pairs of which records are kept appear to be barren, and it might be suggested as one possible natural reason for the chough's failure to recover, even under careful preservation, that the few existing representatives are losing the ability to propagate, perhaps upon account of inevitable in-breeding or merely because certain of the pairs which still exist are now too old to reproduce. This, needless to add, would apply to individual cases only, but with the total stock so limited, every brood is important, and each failure diminishes the chance of racial revival.

Under normal circumstances the chough is prolific, as compared with many species which have fared better in life's battle. Its clutch of eggs sometimes consists of as many as seven, five being about the average. Unfortunately, however, there is a considerable disparity between the number of eggs laid and the young birds which attain maturity. One of the pairs whose fortunes I have followed reared two fledglings in 1936. This summer, the family produced by the same birds presumably, had dwindled to a 'single chick,' and judging from the scanty attention bestowed upon this solitary dependant, it seemed remarkable that even he had survived. My own impressions have forced me to the conclusion that the birds, although irreproachable in the character of mates, are far from being model parents, and that possibly the species has suffered upon this account also. The condition of the solitary fledgling just mentioned struck one as being distinctly forlorn, and it was his manner of proclaiming his discontent that first drew my attention to him as an individual.

Sole descendant of parents who inhabited yet another thrift-crowned fortress now patrolled by eminently pacific Scotch sheep and goats, this scion of an ancient race evinced no pride whatsoever in his heritage. Perched high upon the face of a huge escarpment which dropped

sheer to the ocean, he was clamouring disconsolately for his mother, who, accompanied as usual by her attentive husband, had just left him to his own insufficient devices. There he remained for a while, a pathetic little figure, protesting in vain, flirting his comical bob-tail and endeavouring to screw up the necessary courage for taking wing across the blue water such a fearful distance below. Possibly, after the manner of an 'only child,' he was inclined to be exacting. None the less, his forlorn state compelled sympathy, and when at last he took awkward flight, having reached the conclusion that Mahomet must go to the mountain, one watched his flapping clamorous course with more concern for his safety than his lawful guardians had displayed. An hour later I came accidentally upon the three, feeding amongst some scree about half a mile away. The parent birds effaced themselves in their customary manner, and once again the heir-apparent found himself alone. That he did not also fly was proof of his dependent state. This time no fearsome depths deterred him, but all had happened so suddenly that he was completely at a loss, and could only remain immobile, in that odd posture aptly defined in the vernacular of the West as 'fixed up,' so eminently characteristic of a young bird. The indifference of the old choughs at this crisis was remarkable. Not only had they abandoned the fledgling within fifty yards of human beings—an action entirely contrary to avian procedure—but they had also left him exposed to all the dangers of the wild shore where many older and wiser birds come to grief. At any moment the dashing swoop of a peregrine falcon might have terminated his short story, while the great black-backed gulls and grim ravens which haunt the cliffs are for ever cruising round in search of those unable to look after themselves.

One could not fail to contrast the behaviour of the choughs with that of two carrion crows whose brood had just quitted the nest and was in evidence upon that particular cliff at the same time. When chance brought one anywhere near a young crow, the anxious mother would sweep around, hovering at no great distance overhead, uttering her raucous but obviously heart-felt protestations, which were echoed by her mate, wherever he happened to be. Those crows were pilferers of the

worst description, the base of their home crag being littered with egg-shells—unmistakable evidence of their depredations upon neighbouring farms. The ease with which the poultry-keepers could have taken condign vengeance was only too apparent. Yet the culprits and their family had survived, and one might predict with tolerable certainty that the 'bold, bad' crows, for all their misdemeanour, will continue to haunt the coast, triumphant and aggressive, long after the diffident, inoffensive chough has ceased to be anything more than a picturesque memory.

After a long while, finding that nobody returned in response to his cries, the young bird once again started in search of his official protectors, and this, as I eventually discovered, was the customary order of his life. If he wanted his mother he was compelled to follow her, and this he did most assiduously as his wings grew stronger. Upon one occasion he actually followed a buzzard, but, whether in his anxiety not to be left behind he mistook the big hawk for one of his parents or merely obeyed the instinct of all choughs in his own ridiculous little way was not clear. Whatever his motive, one trembled for the consequences while watching him. The buzzard, however, ignored him utterly, and as the oddly assorted couple passed out of sight around a headland, the two old birds followed in a leisurely manner, as though to see what happened. Apparently no disaster occurred. A day or two later I encountered the trio again—our last meeting. This time, all three flew off, the old pair in company, while the young one took the wrong direction in his hurry, then, discovering his mistake, as usual started a stern chase. Making slow headway, vociferating all the while, and mounting higher than was necessary, he beat out across an intervening bay in the line the others had taken.

And so he passed from view, a diminishing black speck against the hazy outline of the far headland, a pathetic little voice receding into the distance, emblematic of his fading race and its ineffectual effort to keep pace with a world that has proved too progressive.

DOUGLAS GORDON.

Art. 4.—ANCIENT MONUMENTS. ✓

LESS than a century and a half ago, the author of 'Marmion' and 'Waverley' breathed a new life into the drama of history; and his task was easier because of a new interest in its stage. The Gothic revival had involved a taste for ruins and was changing the public attitude towards Ancient Monuments. Horace Walpole, in 1773, had assisted Lord Upper Ossory to mark the site of Amptill Castle, the 'mournful refuge of an injur'd queen.' Lord Arundell of Wardour, in 1778, had considered the restoration of Wardour Castle before he decided to erect his new palace. In his diary for 1792 the Hon. John Byng praised the Duke of Leeds for having secured the remains of Conisbrough Castle by a strong door and repaired the steps leading to it, and he regretted that the owner of Bolton Abbey had repaired his ruins with 'white quarry stone,' not with 'proper rough stone.' James Wyatt, the first of the great new builders of Gothic, helped William Beckford the younger to erect little sham ruins and a stupendous sham Abbey at Fonthill Gifford. Sir Walter Scott repaid his debt to the Gothic builders and their admirers; Lord Hastings, stirred by the popular interest in 'Ivanhoe,' repaired the ruined castle of Ashby de la Zouch. But the new interest was ill-educated, uncertain, and far from universal. Wyatt boldly remodelled great cathedrals, and earned the name of the Destroyer. Byng lamented that 'the possessors of . . . noble ruins disdain to preserve or think of such possessions; devoid of proper pride, or of taste, they abandon them to delapidation and plunder.' And Byng was the first to announce the commercial possibilities of a well-kept monument: 'I often say, and must repeat, why not build a guardian cottage; print a book for them; and let them make their fortune?'

Byng was a dilettante, not a missionary. He did not formulate the principles of appreciation of ancient monuments and he did not look round for leaders in a crusade. He found personal satisfaction in viewing the visible memorials of the past, and he was certain that there were enough like-minded persons to make a policy of preservation commercially sound. The intrinsic merits of such a policy are now conventionally admitted, except by those who feel (as Marinetti did thirty years ago in Italy) that

the past is tending to stifle the future. They are the same merits as those which justify the study of documentary history. If it is desirable to have the facts of history as fully and accurately recorded as possible, it is similarly worth while to preserve, in exact detail, every feature of utility or ornament in the buildings in which former generations lived or worshipped. The habits, the scientific achievements, the moral and spiritual qualities of our ancestors—their meanness or magnificence, their pettiness or boldness—are seen in the mass of facts which the architect and the historian find in the barrows, churches, castles, and manor-houses of England. A building, whole or fragmentary, is a historical document of educational value.

There were two English institutions which embodied, even in Byng's day, something of a scientific conscience in these matters. The Society of Antiquaries of London, founded in 1751, was ranging with ceaseless energy over the antiquities of the world. The Government services which are now organised in the Board of Works and Public Buildings had been dignified by the names of Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren; they had never lacked trained and educated personnel, and they were responsible for the maintenance of Crown property which compelled reverence or respect. But the Antiquaries, zealous and even ferocious (as James Wyatt found) in their defence of the past, had no legal power and little public opinion behind them; while the officials responsible for Public Works, realistic like the private architects and builders, scrapped and built whenever new accommodation was required, and were, until fifty years ago, comparatively unfamiliar with the idea of sterilising a ruin to serve as a historical document. It was not until the middle years of the nineteenth century that certain missionary spirits began to inform the vague romanticism of the English lovers of ruins and to rouse to effectiveness the scientific consciences of the English antiquary and the English civil servant. The change was foreshadowed by John Carter and by A. W. Pugin, but they could not impress it on their age; it was brought about by three men whose seriousness outlived a great deal of ridicule and whose convergent powers were strong enough to move both public opinion and the legislature: John Ruskin, William

Morris, and Sir John Lubbock. In an age when the arts languished, for all that wealth and enterprise could do, these scholars and zealots laboured heroically and not unsuccessfully to save from destruction or travesty the monuments of more creative centuries.

Ruskin published in 1854 his pamphlet entitled, 'The Opening of the Crystal Palace.'* His texts were the contemporary activity of French official architects in restoring (and not merely repairing) the sculptures of the cathedrals of Reims, Amiens, Rouen, Chartres, and Paris, labours in which he found unintended inaccuracies, and the grosser zeal with which French, Swiss, and Italian town councils were stripping their cities of mediæval work and making all things new. He pleaded for a voluntary organisation, with agents

'in every town of importance, who, in the first place, should furnish the society with a *perfect* account of every monument of interest in its neighbourhood, and then with a yearly or half-yearly report of the state of such monuments, and of the changes proposed to be made upon them; the society then furnishing funds, either to buy, freehold, such buildings or other works of untransferable art as at any time might be offered for sale, or to assist their proprietors, whether private individuals or public bodies, in the maintenance of such guardianship as was really necessary for their safety; and exerting itself, with all the influence which such a society would rapidly command, to prevent unwise restoration and unnecessary destruction.'

But he found the time available very short: 'The next five years determine what is to be saved—what destroyed.'

Twenty-three years later, in 1877, William Morris founded a society which only partly realised Ruskin's aims, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. Its work is critical and advisory; it has not become the owner of properties, but it has exerted a considerable influence on property-owners. Its spirit, formed by the circumstances of its birth, has been too austere to gain for it such real popularity as the National Trust and the C.P.R.E. have won. Before the eyes of its founder a generation of uninspired architects was not only building without profit to the country but applying its lack of

* Reprinted in 'On the Old Road,' vol. I.

inspiration to the restoring of what was old. To the Society the duty of preservation covers 'any work . . . over which educated, artistic people would think it worth while to argue at all.' In its view, those who do not 'put Protection in the place of Restoration' are committing forgery. If the old church is too small, it had better not be enlarged; the remedy is to build another. If the Ancient Monument is likely to fall down, it must be patched, but so as to make the patching definitely and permanently different and distinguishable from the old work. The Saxon church of Bradford-on-Avon was restored in 1875, and in 1906 Miss Alice Dryden expressed regret 'that those missing parts were not filled up with some other formation of stone, as already the new work is taking on the all-pervading grey colouring of the place, and it will soon be difficult to distinguish new from old.' A very recent protest, on similar grounds, was made by the Society against Lord Bute's restoration of Caerphilly Castle.

Sir John Lubbock, banker, scientist, and public benefactor, fought long and in the end successfully to implicate the Government in the task of preserving the monuments of our past. He introduced the first Bill for this purpose in 1873, and he was advised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to drop it, to form a limited company, and to rely on private subscription. He persevered until, in 1882, the Ancient Monuments Protection Act was passed. He was concerned chiefly for prehistoric monuments; he bought part of Avebury, from which he took his title later, to prevent its destruction, and he is said to have addressed the Wiltshire Archaeological Society from the top of one of the stones of Stonehenge. The Act bore the marks of his ruling interest; it was drafted, in a firmer spirit than that of his earlier Bills, by the then First Commissioner of Works, Mr G. J. Shaw-Lefevre, later Lord Eversley. The Ancient Monuments Protection Act, 1882, was admittedly not intended to apply to 'castles, abbeys or churches,' or, in fact, buildings in the normal sense of that word. It enacted that the Commissioners of Works might buy Ancient Monuments, or accept gifts or devises of them, or accept guardianship and the duty of maintenance. It directed the Treasury to appoint one or more Inspectors. It imposed penalties for injuring the

monuments. It did not define a monument, but it scheduled sixty-eight in the whole United Kingdom (all, except Old Sarum, prehistoric, and none of them in Cornwall, because Cornwall was a Royal Duchy); and it provided for additions to the schedule by Order in Council. The first Inspector appointed under the Act was General Pitt-Rivers, a Dorset landowner and antiquary, who devoted great energy not only to exploring the prehistoric remains by which his home was surrounded and those confided to his care by Parliament but also to the persuasion of other landowners to entrust the maintenance of their Ancient Monuments to the Office of Works. Discouraged by the Commissioners, who held that the initiative should come from the landowners, he lost interest in the Act, and official activity ceased for some years.

Sir John Lubbock introduced a further Bill in 1891, designed to bring buildings within the scope of the Commissioners' work and to enable them to acquire the freehold or the guardianship of further monuments by agreement. The Bill became law in 1892, but its operation in its final form was restricted to Ireland. A third Act of 1900, due to the present Lord Crawford and Balcarres, applied the provisions of the Irish Act to Great Britain and gave concurrent powers to County and Borough Councils to purchase or to accept guardianship. A fourth Act, passed in 1910, remedied some accidental omissions in the third. In 1908 two Royal Commissions were appointed, for Wales and Monmouthshire and for England respectively, with instructions to make inventories of 'the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions connected with, or illustrative of, the contemporary culture, civilisation, and conditions of life of the people . . . from the earliest times, and to specify those which seem most worthy of preservation.' Both these Commissions, before settling down to the long labour of cataloguing, issued Reports containing very strong criticisms of the existing state of affairs. The English Commission reported in June 1910 that valuable monuments were being destroyed or injured, and urged that the matter should be 'dealt with by a Government Department acting with the assistance of a permanent Advisory Board.' The Welsh Commission, in 1911, held

an inquiry at which it was informed that the Acts were a dead letter in Wales, and it reported in terms similar to those used by the English Commission.

Both the public and the Government were moved. In December 1911 Sir Edward Grey circularised His Majesty's representatives in fourteen European capitals and at Washington, inquiring what measures of control the governments to which they were accredited had adopted. The replies revealed wide divergences in the method and the range of control. Unfortunately, the French Chambers were still considering new legislation, and the summary of the great French law of Dec. 31, 1913, was received too late to be useful; for in 1912 a Government Bill and two private members' Bills were introduced into Parliament. The three Bills were referred to a Joint Select Committee of both houses, and a number of witnesses were examined. The architects urged that ecclesiastical buildings should be protected against possible maltreatment by their owners, but the Chancellor of the Diocese of London protested indignantly. The President of the Board of Education praised Ancient Monuments for their educational value, and stated that school visits to them were counted as lessons. The representative of the County Councils admitted that the councils were afraid of spending money on Ancient Monuments and had made little use of the Act of 1900. Lord Curzon put in a forcible and interesting memorandum; he felt that cathedrals and important churches needed protection, and he believed in restoration 'with a view of showing to modern or later times what [the monument] was like in its original state' (he himself had carried out such restorations in India and at Tattershall Castle). The Government then introduced a fresh Bill, which became law in 1913. It consolidated and amended the law; and it was itself amended in 1931, under the threat of large-scale quarrying close to the Roman Wall.

The Acts of 1913 and 1931, which apply only to Great Britain, may be summarised as follows: The Commissioners of Works, or a County or Borough Council, may become owners of an Ancient Monument by purchase, gift, or devise, or they may become its permanent Guardians; they may then maintain it. They may carry out work or help to finance it on monuments not in their care.

They may veto, by a Preservation Order, the demolition, removal, or alteration of any Ancient Monument; if no objection is raised, the Order remains in force indefinitely, but in the event of objection within three months of publication, the Order remains effective for 21 months and may be made permanently binding by Parliament. The Commissioners may veto, by a Preservation Scheme, the impairing of the amenities of an Ancient Monument. They must publish lists of all monuments of national importance, whether in their charge or not. They must set up an Ancient Monuments Board or Boards, to advise them, and a body of Inspectors. A monument is defined as a 'building structure or other work, whether above or below the surface of the ground, other than an ecclesiastical building for the time being used for ecclesiastical purposes, and any cave or excavation'; and an ancient monument is defined as: (1) any monument named in the schedule to the Act of 1882, or (2) any monument included in the Commissioners' published list, or (3) any monument which the Commissioners consider to be of like character, or of which the preservation is, in the opinion of the Commissioners, a matter of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, traditional, artistic, or archaeological interest attaching thereto, together with the necessary adjacent or access lands. But inhabited buildings, as well as ecclesiastical buildings in use, are expressly excluded from the Acts.

To carry out these duties, and to maintain the much smaller group of royal palaces and other structures known as Historic Buildings, the Office of Works employs in Great Britain a secretarial staff (most of whom have other duties as well), an inspectorate, and an architectural staff. The inspectorate is composed of the Chief Inspector, three Inspectors, and three Assistant Inspectors, and a clerical staff. The architectural staff includes an architect, assistant architects, draughtsmen, eight superintendents of works, and a body of foremen. This staff is linked with the Advisory Ancient Monuments Boards for England, Wales, and Scotland, which as a rule select the monuments to be placed on its published lists ('scheduled'). From 1928-29 to 1936-37 its share in the national expenditure by way of works and salaries has grown from 75,000*l.* to 94,000*l.* (not including the

salaries of the officers employed on other work as well) ; but a little less than half these sums is recovered in admission fees and returns from the sale of guide-books and post-cards. The public interest has been growing steadily for some years, and it is not likely to fall off. Recent debates in the House of Lords and the House of Commons have revealed it as both widespread and deeply felt.

The scope of this work, restricted as it is by statute and by Treasury control, has expanded year by year since the revival of interest in it in 1910 and the subsequent creation of a responsible staff. Sixty-eight monuments, not one of which was a building, were scheduled in the Act of 1882. In 1912 the Office of Works had charge of 116 Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings. By 1931 about 3,000 Ancient Monuments had been scheduled and 280 were under official care. At the end of 1935 more than 4,400 Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings had been scheduled ; 304 of these were under the care of the Commissioners under the Ancient Monuments Acts, and 61 as Crown property ; ten had reverted to occupation or use ; 23 (in Wiltshire) had passed into the hands of other Government Departments ; and eight had been demolished or destroyed since they were scheduled. It must be remembered that the Ancient Monuments in Ireland, which were always the care of a separate body of Commissioners, are now the subjects of purely Irish legislation and statistically independent. Eighteen monuments in Ireland were scheduled by the Act of 1882 ; 15 of these, with 313 others, are now controlled by the Office of Public Works in Dublin, and three, with 40 others, by the Ministry of Finance in Belfast. The County and Borough Councils have concurrent powers with the Commissioners under the Act of 1900, but have made little use of them. Other powers of acquisition and preservation are conferred on them by the Town and Country Planning Act, 1932.

The separate action of the Governments of Ireland forms an interesting parallel to legislation and administration in Great Britain. Through the efforts of the Irish antiquaries, 137 ruinous disused ecclesiastical structures 'which by reason of their architectural character or antiquity are deemed worthy of preservation' were

transferred, under the Irish Church Act of 1869, to the Commissioners of Public Works in Dublin, and the work of preservation was begun in 1875 and actively carried on. The Ancient Monuments Acts of 1882 and 1910, but not the Act of 1913, applied to Ireland as well as to Great Britain. In 1922 legislative power was given to the Free State, and the Free State's National Monuments Act of 1930 conferred on the Commissioners in Dublin somewhat wider powers than His Majesty's Office of Works enjoys. The monuments in their ownership or guardianship, under the Act of 1869 or that of 1930, are now 328 in number ; the monuments in County Council charge, as in England, are few in number.

The Government of Northern Ireland took over from the Commissioners in Dublin 24 Ancient Monuments or groups of monuments, and placed them in the charge of the Works Division of the Ministry of Finance. The previous legislation applicable to Ireland was (in effect) consolidated and amended on English lines by the Ancient Monuments Act (Northern Ireland), 1926. The number of monuments or groups of monuments under the care of the Ministry has risen to 43. Thus in Great Britain, as in Ireland, no building still inhabited or still used for worship, however great its architectural or historical value may be, is (or can be) protected by the State against disfigurement or destruction. (In law, the Office of Works may purchase an inhabited house, but the practical difficulties are considered prohibitive.) The State cannot in practice intervene until a house or a church has become a ruin. The problem thus set was considered by the Ancient Monuments Advisory Committee, which was set up in 1920 and reported in 1921.

The Committee's report was comprehensive and constructive ; it contained proposals of the greatest value, some of which have been carried out. It pointed out the weakness of English protective legislation as compared with Continental models, and especially with French. It recommended that the Commissioners should be authorised to contribute to the expenses incurred by the owners of monuments in repairing them, and that inhabited houses, great or small, urban or rural, should be brought within the provisions of the Acts, the owners being compensated for any consequential loss. As regards

parish churches, the Committee noted that any changes in fabric required the consent of the diocesan Chancellor, and that in most dioceses expert Advisory Committees had been set up since 1913 to assist the Chancellors in archæological and artistic matters; and they recommended that these Committees should be appointed in all dioceses and clothed with greater authority. As regards cathedrals, they noted that these buildings were in practice under the unfettered control of the deans and chapters and their architects, and they suggested that in each province reference to 'a central body parallel in importance and in personal calibre to the Ancient Monuments Boards' should be compulsory before the structures were altered. If such a scheme were not put into force, they recommended the extension of the Ancient Monuments Acts to include cathedrals. Finally, they recommended the establishment of a Commission of Fine Arts to advise the Government in these and other matters. Of these recommendations, some have been carried out by legislation and some in other ways. The National Trust and its Scottish brother association have proved unexpectedly strong allies for the Government in protecting civil buildings. The position of church buildings is still unsatisfactory in comparison.

The National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or National Beauty was incorporated in 1894, as a company limited by guarantee 'for the purposes of promoting the permanent preservation for the benefit of the nation of lands and hereditaments (including buildings) of beauty or historic interest and as regards lands for the preservation (so far as practicable) of their natural aspect features and animal and plant life.' It was remodelled and empowered to hold land without licence in mortmain by the National Trust Act, 1907 (Private Acts 7 Edw. VII, c. cxxxvi). It was subsequently held to be a charity, and by a scheme of the Charity Commission, confirmed by Private Act in 1919 (9 & 10 Geo. V, c. lxxxiv), it was authorised, with the consent of the Commission, to grant leases of its property and to acquire land for amenities. It is a new, strong, and beneficent force in the task of preserving our inheritance. It proceeds by way of acquiring and administering, so far as private generosity in money or in kind allows it, Historic Buildings threatened

with destruction and landscapes threatened by the unsympathetic builder. In 1907 it held 29 properties in England, Wales, and Ireland; it now owns, or has controlled by covenants, nearly 70,000 acres of property, with upwards of 70 historic and more than 170 naturally beautiful sites. It has 84 local committees or sub-committees; 67 societies are affiliated to it, and wide public support, represented most picturesquely by Ferguson's Gang, is behind it.

The propaganda and advice of the S.P.A.B., the cautious enlargement of its schedules and its active work by the Office of Works and the steady progress of the National Trust in its normal range of work are all insufficient to meet the dangers which each of them admits. There is active in the country a passion for pulling down and rebuilding, stimulated by the desire to provide great popular places of amusement; the most striking recent instance is the destruction of a notable house at Berkhamstead, 350 years old, to be replaced by a cinema. There is an insistence, inclined to be pedantic, on certain sanitary standards in every dwelling-house; the result is the disappearance of very many good examples of the humbler houses of the past. The greater houses are menaced by the economic difficulties of their owners. The Napoleonic Wars resulted in heavy taxation and the dismantling of many great or beautiful houses; the Great War is having the same result. This last problem has been met in France by a very successful association of owners of châteaux, 'La Demeure Historique,' and the National Trust launched a scheme partly based on the French model.

The Trust's Historic Houses scheme was intended, in brief, to federate the owners of such buildings, to help them with revenues from the public and a lessened liability to the Exchequer, and so to arrest the process of evacuation. The Government was to be asked, not unhelpfully, for fiscal concessions in return for a minimum of public admission. The owners were to have the opportunity of giving, or bequeathing, their properties to the Trust, with the reservation of limited interests to their families. The list of Historic Houses was to be drawn up under advice from the Office of Works. The scheme required the concurrence of the Treasury, the legislature,

and the owners, and none of these bodies is yet committed ; indeed, the reaction of the selected owners to the circular letters of the Trust showed a great deal of that sturdy individualism which has hampered other reformers. But only this scheme, or something like it, will save most of our great private houses from becoming public institutions, museum pieces, or memories.

It is not altogether the result of English piety that ancient buildings in which our ancestors worshipped are to-day as numerous as buildings in which they lived, and that the class of monuments which neither the State nor the National Trust protects, furnishes as important a problem. The zeal of Thomas Cromwell has made it possible for the State and the National Trust to acquire or to guard a number of beautiful ruins of an ecclesiastical character, but the parish churches and the cathedrals remain. Hitherto, the rights of property in them have been subject to no derogation except in favour of higher ecclesiastical authority. The derogation within those limits has been greater than is generally realised, but it is questionable whether an overriding power ought not to be vested in the State. And the question may be raised without denying the evident fact that the first use of a church or a cathedral is for to-day's public worship and the salvation of living souls.

The protective system of the Church of England (and for practical purposes the discussion of ecclesiastical monuments may here be confined to Church of England property) is based upon two principles : that the Archdeacon must see that the fabric of a church is maintained, and that every addition or alteration to a church requires the previous issue of a faculty by the Chancellor of the diocese. The first of these has excited little comment, but the second has become controversial. The Chancellor is an expert in ecclesiastical law, and not necessarily in art or archæology ; and in the discussions which preceded the passing of the Ancient Monuments Act of 1913 it was widely urged that his jurisdiction was not an adequate safeguard against the mutilation of ecclesiastical monuments. The inference that these should be brought under the Act was drawn, but the Archbishop of Canterbury promised that the system should be revised in the light of criticism, and the Act, as passed, did not apply to ecclesiastical buildings

used for ecclesiastical purposes. The Bishops proceeded at once to set up in their several dioceses Advisory Committees, composed of expert clergymen and laymen, to assist the Chancellors 'in architectural, archaeological, historical, and artistic matters'; and to-day such a committee exists in almost every diocese. It was then recognised that central guidance (not central control) was necessary; in 1921 a Central Council of Advisory Committees was formed to advise the diocesan Committees and others who might appeal to it. In 1924 the Church Assembly gave to the Central Council a written constitution and recognised two Provincial Advisory Committees which should link it with the dioceses.

The system thus established was accepted by the Ancient Monuments Advisory Committee of 1920 as useful, but not as completely satisfactory; and indeed it is open to serious criticism. The good diocesan Committees are learned, enlightened, and conscientious, and they are guided largely by the principles and by the direct advice of the S.P.A.B. But the Bishops are not obliged to appoint Committees. The Chancellor need not consult or agree with the Committee. The cathedrals and collegiate churches are exempt. The Central Council's admirable practical admonitions, addressed to questions of maintenance as well as to questions of alteration or addition, are mere admonitions. To prevent destruction the Council might need to oppose high spiritual claims; to prevent disfigurement it must command a loyalty which is sometimes lacking; to prevent neglect it must assume the existence of funds which are not always available. A disused ecclesiastical building may well rot and continue to rot, despite the Archdeacon, until it becomes definitely unusable, when the Office of Works or the National Trust may (if it is exceptionally interesting) take over the maintenance of what is left. The system is a partial safeguard against the active mutilation of ecclesiastical monuments, but hardly any safeguard against their neglect; and it is still decentralised to an extent which conforms with the genius of the English Church, and has some practical advantages, but which does not ensure uniform standards of taste or scruple. Lastly (and most important), it settles the age-long struggle between the active priest or prelate and the

jealous antiquary in favour of the Church at every stage until the very last ; for at every stage, unless and until the case comes before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, it is ecclesiastical authority which decides. That is the English method, which since Thomas Cromwell's day has forsworn revolutions. The French method is different.

The French law as to ancient monuments is the growth of a hundred years, and it has become stronger than our own. The first French building bought by the State 'to ensure its preservation' was the Baptistère St. Jean at Poitiers, acquired in 1834. The first Inspector-General of Historic Monuments was Prosper Mérimée, appointed in the same year. Many inspectors-general have held office since then, and some, like Viollet-le-Duc, have left a great name. Many buildings, of which some are widely famous, have been acquired. Many laws have been passed, but the powers of the Bureau des Monuments Historiques are now derived from the law of Dec. 31, 1913, as amended in 1927 and 1931. It is the duty of the Minister of Fine Arts, to whose office the Bureau belongs, to classify as Historic Monuments and to schedule 'buildings whose preservation is a matter of public interest from the historical or the artistic point of view.' If the owner opposes classification, his appeal lies to the Conseil d'Etat ; and if he loses his case the Minister, the Department, or the Commune may expropriate. No classified monument may be touched without the authority nor except under the supervision of the Minister. The Minister has wide powers of intervention, and from him the chain of responsibility runs, in the simple and effective French administrative fashion, through the Prefect of the Department to the Mayor of the Commune. A museum and information office in matters of Historical Monuments is to be formed, and courses of training for the official architectural posts have been opened. Nor has the French Government left the protection of scenic beauty to a private society ; a law was passed on May 2, 1930, to organise the classification and defence of 'natural monuments.'

The powers and duties of the Bureau des Monuments Historiques extend to cathedrals and churches, and their application is simplified by the fact that these buildings

are State property. The National Assembly in Paris, on Nov. 4, 1794, declared that all ecclesiastical property was at the disposal of the nation. The *loi du 18 Germinal au X* (April 8, 1802) remitted the churches 'à raison d'un édifice par cure et par succursale,' to the bishops. The 'loi du 9 Decembre 1905 concernant la séparation des églises et de l'état,' in transferring their *jouissance* to the new *associations cultuelles*, provided that they should be examined by the Ministry of Public Education and Fine Arts with a view to the 'classement définitif de ceux de ces objets dont la conservation présenterait, au point de vue de l'histoire ou de l'art, un intérêt suffisant.' Thus it was that Arras Cathedral became a Historical Monument; that when it had been destroyed by the German artillery in 1914-18 it was rebuilt by the State; and that the approval of the French Government was necessary before a tablet could be placed in it commemorating the British dead of the Great War.

'Nul travail de réparation, restauration ou entretien à faire aux monuments . . . classés ne peut être commencé sans l'autorisation du Ministre des beaux-arts, ni exécuté hors de la surveillance de son administration . . .' And: 'La visite des édifices . . . classés [sera public; il ne pourra] donner lieu à aucune taxe ni redevance.'

The French Government of 1905 was strongly anti-clerical. It had no desire to encourage public worship or the salvation of souls. The clauses quoted above are parts of a law which was bitterly resisted by the French Church; but if State control of ecclesiastical monuments were introduced in England it need not come with such auspices. The scheduling of those cathedrals and churches 'whose preservation was sufficiently important from the historical or the artistic point of view'; the extension to them of the suspensory powers of the Office of Works, and of the power to assist in preservation or maintenance work; the conferment of a more authoritative status on the diocesan Advisory Committees, the Provincial Committees, and the Central Council, and the representation of the Office of Works on the larger bodies—all these are reforms which might be passed in agreement with the Church, and which would in time help to reconcile the ecclesiastical and antiquarian points of view. The

primary purpose of an ecclesiastical building is public worship. The Church of England has never appeared to disparage, in this connection, the value of outward beauty and the power of continuity with the past.

The treatment of Ancient Monuments is a matter of two problems: that of the administrative system and that of the practical method. The former is still arguable, and is discussed in the preceding pages; the latter has almost ceased to be disputed. Under Viollet-le-Duc and some of his successors the French Government reconstructed Carcassonne and the Palace of the Popes at Avignon; to-day the Bureau proclaims its faith in the rule laid down by Mérimée a hundred years ago: 'to add nothing to what time has left us; to be content with cleaning and consolidation.' In Great Britain, Lord Curzon restored castles to show to his generation and their successors what the buildings were like originally; Lord Bute has done the same at Cardiff and at Caerphilly; Colonel MacRae-Gilstrap did it at Eilean Donan castle in Ross-shire. These generous uses of enthusiasm and wealth have their great value, but while the tourist is helped and educated by the result, the student is baffled. The principles and practice of the Office of Works, never publicly announced, are summed up in the word 'Protection,' which appears in the title of the Act of 1882. Similarly, the Commissioners of Public Works in Dublin have from the first decided against reconstruction, and have recently announced that their 'guiding principle is conservation of the existing remains, not *restoration*.' The Ministry of Finance at Belfast has adopted the principles followed in London. Reconstruction is still carried out in Germany by the Schlossbauverein; but the Third Reich inherited from the former States a mass of enlightened and stringent legislation, and is not likely to fail in scholarly treatment of the greater monuments of the past.

The official practice, in Great Britain, in Ireland, and in France, is based upon the value of original work as a historical or artistic document. As a damaged manuscript may be reinforced and cleaned, but not completed, or a worn Old Master cleaned but not repainted, so a ruined building may be cleaned and strengthened, but not deprived of its value as a document by being recon-

structed. It is made intelligible by clearing débris and by restoring the ground levels. It is made safe by removing vegetation and by strengthening walls that have become unsound. Defective joints and dangerous gaps are filled in. Behind the surface, engineering devices of steel or concrete are employed to reinforce the work of the old builders, or in some cases to make good their technical failures. In the English practice, added work must—if it is visible—harmonise in texture and colour with the old work. The Irish practice is 'to rebuild in the same materials as those surrounding but in such a manner that the new work will be permanently recognisable as such, without being obtrusive'; and in this it comes nearer to the counsels of the S.P.A.B. The French Commission des Monuments Historiques has within the last six months recommended

' qu'à titre exceptionnel un essai de réparation soit tenté sur une travée de l'Amphithéâtre d'Arles en employant une formule nouvelle : les pierres neuves, tout en restant identifiées, devront avoir un aspect ancien, afin de ne pas détruire l'harmonie de lignes et de couleurs du monument ; '

and in this it has consciously committed a little sin, such as its predecessors loved, against the austerity of its own code. In general, there is real agreement in principle between the French, British, and Irish services ; the problem of restoration or repair has been settled.

There is a last problem, a moral problem like the others, but more difficult, which these services have to face. They possess a certain number of what are called in England 'Historic Buildings'; that is, monuments complete and still in use. Private, municipal, and ecclesiastical owners in England possess very large numbers of such buildings. The methods of preservation are well known. The difficulty resides in the occasional need of enlargement. The earlier builders did not recognise any problem ; they pulled down and rebuilt or they built on in their contemporary style. They all admitted what the Central Council of Advisory Committees has surprisingly called a 'Victorian claim': 'that the artist or architect of to-day has a right to leave his own impression on an ancient building or to obscure or alter it.' The nineteenth-century architects, as a rule, copied the existing work ;

and it was because the copies were not always even accurate that the S.P.A.B. taught that it was better to leave the old building alone and put up a new one.

For evident reasons, the problem of enlargement must occasionally be faced by those who are responsible for Historic Buildings, and almost all solutions are unsatisfactory. To add an extension in the modern style would be an intolerable *mésalliance*, for English architecture has ceased to develop and has made a fresh start. To copy the existing building would be to abdicate the functions of an architect, and incidentally to apply modern building methods to a style for which they were not intended. The admissible compromise seems to be to avoid both challenge and subservience ; to respect the proportions and the spirit of the older work without copying them, and to give them the modern architect's expression in the new work. The new building must inevitably be subordinate to the old, and simpler ; but, since proportion is the first and the most durable virtue in a building, it need not be unworthy.

H. F. CHETTLÉ.

Art. 5.—EXTRATERRITORIALITY IN CHINA.

FOR many years China and Egypt have been the only two countries bound by the practice of extraterritoriality. Since the signing of the Montreux Convention on May 8, providing for the abolition of the Capitulations in Egypt, China has lost her lone companion and henceforth will be the only nation in the world fettered by extraterritoriality without any fixed date for its abolition. The singular subjection of China to the burdens of this anachronistic system naturally intensifies the bitter feeling of her people. Consequently the extraterritoriality question has become once more an irritating issue between China and the nations enjoying extraterritorial privileges. In order to understand the complicated system of extraterritoriality, which is as difficult to define as it is awkward to pronounce, we must review the circumstances under which it was introduced and examine some of the peculiarities surrounding its operation.

The principle of extraterritoriality was first established in China by the Russo-Chinese treaty of 1689. But in this case the privileges were reciprocal. In their early years of intercourse both China and Russia found it troublesome and irritating to exercise jurisdiction over the neighbour's subjects sojourning within their boundaries. Therefore, each agreed that such subjects of its neighbour-state should be controlled by that neighbour's own officials according to its law. This form of reciprocal extraterritoriality was changed by the Sino-British Treaty of Nanking of 1842, and the consequent General Regulations of Trade of the next year, as a result of the 'Opium War.' The principle of 'unilateral' extraterritoriality was vaguely introduced, according to which British subjects in China should be subject to British law and Chinese subjects in Great Britain also should be subject to British law, an arrangement which Young China now considers as being 'heads the foreigners win, tails the Chinese lose.'

The stipulation contained in the British treaty was, however, crude in form and ambiguous in language. Clear and definite establishment of the principle was made in the Wanghia Treaty which Caleb Cushing negotiated for the United States in 1844. Therefore, it

has been often asserted, though incorrectly, that extraterritoriality was introduced by the United States. Within a few months France secured a treaty which closely resembled the American document. The next year Belgium got similar rights. Three years later Norway and Sweden concluded treaties with China which also followed the American model. The principle was further amplified by the Chefoo Treaty of 1876 with Great Britain, which stipulated that 'so long as the laws of the two countries differ from each other,' extraterritoriality should remain. The example as set by Great Britain and the United States was invariably followed by all foreign Powers which came into diplomatic relations with China thereafter—Japan being the last to acquire such privileges in 1896, while she herself did not get rid of the shackles until 1899.

Thus, without realising what they were doing, the mandarins concluded one after another these one-sided treaties and signed away China's birthrights without getting any adequate compensation in return. What made China's position worse was the insertion, without proper safeguards, of the most-favoured-nation clause in the early treaties. By this clause it was generally understood that 'should His Majesty the Emperor, from any cause whatever, be pleased to grant any additional privileges to any foreign Power, the same privileges and immunities will be extended to, and enjoyed by, all the other Powers having this clause in their treaties with China.' Besides other effects this clause at once induced the treaty Powers to form a bloc in facing China, which has accounted so much for China's loss of extraterritorial and other rights. Whenever any nation raised a cry for some special privileges, there usually echoed the support of a number of other nations, for the latter well knew that the most-favoured-nation clause would entitle all to enjoy every privilege any one of them could get—it made little difference the method used or the circumstances surrounding the case.

The reason for the conclusion of these 'unequal' treaties was simple. When China began her intercourse with the West the Manchu Dynasty, as a result of its own impotence and the widespread revolutionary movement, was on its downhill course to dissolution. During these

years the whole purpose of Chinese statesmanship *vis-à-vis* the West was to close the door of the nation and have as little to do with the foreigner as possible. Moreover, the mandarins, being trained only in the Confucian classics, had no clear idea of the Western nations. Not only were the consequences unrealised, but the meaning of the clumsy word 'extraterritoriality' itself was perhaps not understood. As the extraterritorial stipulations were to govern the bad behaviour of a handful of troublesome 'barbarians' at a few spots on the fringes of the sea, no Chinese dreamed that such stipulations could be used in the future to curb their country's independence. Since very few Chinese went abroad and China's policy was rather against emigration, the mandarins did not think it worth while to demand that Chinese emigrants should likewise carry Chinese law with them. Indeed, it was perhaps considered good policy to leave to their own fate those few Chinese who ventured to leave the shores of the Middle Kingdom.

On the other hand, when the Westerner first came to the East he found Oriental laws in practice radically different from his own. The assumption was that he should carry his own law with him, and this assumption had the support of his government. Therefore, the Westerners on landing in Asia generally considered themselves free from all local jurisdiction. In fact, it is reported that in those early days the general attitude of the West towards China, Japan, and all other non-Christian countries was that it was quite within the precepts of the Bible and of civilisation to extract by force every advantage out of those heathen countries. So, in recalling the circumstances under which China lost her extraterritoriality rights, Young China feels that in China's troubled and backward days the West seized the opportunity to seek its own benefit out of China's misfortune. The advocates of the West, however, say that China's misfortune was due to her own fault. 'All the system of unequal treaties was not of our own choosing,' said the late Sir Austen Chamberlain in a speech made in London in September, 1925. 'We did not desire it; it was the minimum which we could ask of a China that repelled the foreigner and would not give him justice in its own courts. . . .'

Until recently, twenty countries—Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States—enjoyed extraterritoriality in China; therefore, twenty different systems of laws were in operation at the same time. In any lawsuit, if defendants of different nationalities are involved, which is quite common in such cosmopolitan centres as Canton and Shanghai, not only must they be proceeded against in different courts, but their rights and responsibilities must be determined according to the large number of different systems of law involved. In addition to the confusion, cost, and inconvenience, one immediate result of this multiplicity of laws is that many foreigners can engage with impunity in all sorts of illicit business, either in defiance of the law or because there is no law of their own countries that would cover the case. Thus, Italians engaged in the opium trade before October 1, 1921, might have met with no punishment, because no Italian law penalising such trade had been passed before that date. Another serious objection is that the various systems of foreign law have to be administered by the different Consuls, most of whom, being commercial agents, have neither legal training nor court experience. Incompetence is the natural result, to which must be added the difficulty in bringing witnesses from far-away places.

By this system the consular judges are under constant pressure to favour their own nationals. Cases of wholesale bias are too many to enumerate. For instance, during recent years there have been numerous cases where foreigners, especially Japanese and Koreans, have been caught red-handed in smuggling, kidnapping, gun-running, military espionage, and illicit traffic in narcotics. In all these cases of criminal offence the culprits invariably had to be handed over to the foreign consuls, after which nothing further was heard about them! Gambling-houses and opium-dens need only hire foreigners as gate-keepers to ward off police interference. As Lord Milner observed * on this subject, it was a serious evil that

* Vide 'The Times' of April 10, 1937.

'foreign criminals should not be amenable to the courts of the land even when natives or the native Government are the victims . . . but the nuisance becomes intolerable where the foreign authority . . . allows itself to be biased in favour of the criminal because he is a fellow-countryman.'

Its inherent evils become even worse when extraterritoriality is applied in the so-called 'concessions' or 'settlements.' These concessions are frequently used as places of asylum by fugitives, especially corrupt officials, politicians, and soldiery, who rush there for safety, and who, from within the concession boundaries, indulge in political intrigues. Political 'outs' also find refuge in the concessions, pending the change of fortune. Notorious bandit-leaders, like Liu Kuei-tang, after ravaging several provinces needed only to return to the Japanese concession in Tientsin in order to plan and direct the so-called autonomy movement of the Northern Provinces. Extraterritoriality also prevents China from deporting any foreigner, no matter how offensive he may be. The only way China can get rid of any foreigner, even a lunatic or a desperado, is to bring suit against him in the foreign courts. The result is that practically no foreigner has been deported by China throughout all these years. Consequently, some foreigners, including many newspaper correspondents, often indulge in broadcasting falsehoods against China and the Chinese Government. Perhaps that is one reason why we hear so much bad news from China.

This system, with its inherent defects, at once becomes not only inconvenient but dangerous when an increasing number of foreigners come into the country. Take, for example, the Koreans. When they are in Korea they are Koreans, but once they cross the Yalu River they become Japanese and for all practical purposes enjoy the extraterritorial and other privileges of the Japanese, Britons, or Americans. This is, perhaps, one of the reasons why over 500,000 Koreans have migrated into the Three Eastern Provinces (Manchuria) during recent years. This immigration serves a double purpose; it makes room in Korea for the Japanese and extends Japan's domain in China. This state of affairs is rapidly building up a state within a state, and will soon create another Balkans in the Far East, with all its minority and other bad complications. Another dangerous effect of extraterritoriality

was vividly illustrated by what happened during the War of Shanghai in 1932. While the battles of Woosung and Kiangwan were raging, a number of Japanese military transports loaded with munitions and reinforcements had to be piloted into Shanghai by foreign pilots, because Japanese pilots could not do the job. Against such outrageous acts China was helpless, because those pilots were protected by extraterritoriality.

Extraterritoriality also destroys China's financial autonomy. For instance, silver for many centuries has been the currency of China. The sudden and sharp rise in the value of silver during 1934 caused a similar rise in the exchange value of Chinese currency. Chinese produce became too dear in relation to world prices, exports fell off, and silver had to be exported in enormous quantities to meet the alarming adverse balance of trade. This, in turn, caused a contraction of credit and an acute deflationary crisis. Prices fell, debts could not be met, and the banks became more and more frozen. The exchange market became dangerously weak and China was on the verge of calamitous nation-wide bankruptcy. Indeed, China's position was far more critical than that of the United States in 1932-3, and she was forced to resort to devaluation and adopt an inconvertible managed currency on the basis of her own resources. But China's efforts to meet this national crisis were almost frustrated by the refusal of a large number of foreigners and foreign banks to pay any attention to the Chinese Government's orders. In order to balance her budget China introduced a moderate income-tax last year. Here again, under the protection of extraterritoriality, foreigners and foreign firms ignored the Chinese law and flatly refused to pay any income-tax, thus making it extremely difficult for China to carry out her scheme. In this connection we must point out that many missionaries have voluntarily agreed to pay Chinese taxes.

China has been making strenuous efforts in suppressing opium, but her efforts have been seriously obstructed by extraterritoriality. The following report in 'The Times' of April 7, 1937, as received from its Peiping correspondent, vividly pictures the situation :

' Six Chinese drug pedlars were to-day executed by a firing squad outside the Temple of Heaven, bringing to eighteen

the total drug pedlars executed since Jan. 1, when the law providing for capital punishment for drug pedlars and addicts came into force. To-day's executions were preceded by the public burning of nearly 2 cwt. of confiscated opium and heroin.

'The campaign of the Chinese authorities to stamp out the traffic in drugs appears, however, to be doomed to failure so long as Koreans can freely engage in such commerce, under the cover of extraterritoriality. Japanese sources declare that 450 houses in Peking are now occupied by Korean drug dealers, engaged mostly in the retail sale of heroin.'

As corroborated by the 'Peiping Chronicle,' 'China stands helpless in dealing with the extraterritorialized offenders. She may mete out the most drastic penalties to Chinese offenders who are only underlings, but she could do nothing to the foreign offenders.' Although Japan in this case again is the principal offender, so long as the illicit trade is carried on under extraterritoriality and the other Powers join hands with Japan in maintaining that system those other Powers must share the blame. Whatever may have been the reasons for the introduction of extraterritoriality, when that privilege is so abused as to give protection to slave traffic, gun-running, and illicit trade in addictive drugs, as in China, then all the reasons for its continuation fall to the ground. Hereafter it is no longer a question for China to justify the abolition of extraterritoriality by the improvement of her jurisprudence, but rather it has become a duty of the interested Powers to justify the continuation of this anachronistic system by removing the atrocious abuses inherent in that system.

One of the many outstanding reasons * against the abolition of extraterritoriality is that the administration of Chinese law is often alleged to be subject to interference and dictation at the hands not only of the military chiefs but of groups and associations for the furtherance of political objectives.† Extraterritoriality cannot be abolished, declared 'The Times' on Jan. 1, 1931, 'until there is a real Government in China . . . and until there

* The reasons against abolition of extraterritoriality are ably set forth in H. G. W. Woodhead's 'Extraterritoriality in China, the Case against Abolition.' Tientsin, 1929.

† The British Minister's Note to Nanking dated Aug. 10, 1929.

are real Courts of Justice capable of giving independent judgments. . . .’ It must be admitted that to a certain extent the charge of ‘interference and dictation’ is sometimes true; but it must also be admitted that China is not the only unfortunate country to be cursed by such ‘interference and dictation.’ For instance were not the recent State trials in Moscow widely spoken of as evidence of the Soviet’s ‘unspeakable iniquity of framing up’? ‘The judges’ task,’ commented ‘The Times’ on Jan. 27, 1937, ‘is not to assess the degree of guilt or of innocence, but to interpret the State’s will in deciding how to dispose of the guilt. The whole process is loathsome.’ Fortunately, we have not heard such a serious indictment against China yet.

With regard to the charge that there is no government in China, impartial observers must admit that this assertion is no longer tenable. Under the able and enlightened leadership of General Chiang Kai-shek, ‘the progress which China has already made in restoring prosperity and in the unification of the country,’ to quote Sir J. S. Wardlaw Milne, as printed in ‘The Times’ of Nov. 6, 1933, ‘may well be described as remarkable.’ The National Government of China to-day possesses more prestige and power than any of its predecessors enjoyed, and the New Life Movement has done much in transforming the mentality and outlook of the people. The whole nation is beginning to find itself. Even biased critics must admit that there is ‘a real Government in China.’ But the vested interests claim that Chinese law is unsuitable for the Westerner, and, therefore, before China can abolish extraterritoriality, she must so modify her laws as to meet with the general approval of all the Powers concerned. China, naturally, cannot accept this contention, because, as Dr Wang Chung-hui said,* Chinese laws are primarily for the 400,000,000 Chinese and not for a small group of foreign visitors. Moreover, if the foreign guests find China’s laws and conditions unsuitable, as the late Wu Chao-chu remarked in a speech in September, 1929, they are always free to depart. Foreigners also make the charge that the Chinese judges would accept bribes and that Chinese torture would make any innocent person

* In a statement in the ‘New York Times,’ June 29, 1929.

admit his guilt ; similarly, the Chinese may retort that they are not convinced that foreign consuls or magistrates do not take bribes or that the famous ' third degree ' is much less hideous than Chinese torture. Moreover, the foreigners' system of trial by jury when it involves Chinese, as practised in far-away China, often appears like a farce.

The Chinese contention, in a nutshell, is that Chinese law and law courts may be bad in certain respects, but they also believe that laws and law courts in some other countries are certainly no better. Young China feels that so far as law and law-enforcement are concerned, all nations more or less live in glass houses. To make a long story short, both sides have been putting forth arguments enough to fill volumes and are able to produce ample evidence to support their arguments. But as the question is not one to be settled by debate, it remains for statesmanship to bring the solution.

Several factors strengthen the position of China. In the first place, she has made much progress in the modernisation of her laws and law-courts and is not handicapped, as Egypt has been, by a multitude of religious tribunals which interfere with civil affairs. Moreover, even the severest critics admit that Chinese judges have been winning increased confidence and respect. Another and more important factor is that out of a total of thirty-one nations having diplomatic relations with China, only six, namely Brazil, France, Great Britain, Holland, Japan, and the United States, are opposed to the abolition of extraterritoriality, while the remaining twenty-five nations have either lost or given up the privilege, or else have agreed to surrender it as soon as ' all the other Powers will do so.' Moreover, the nationals of the large number of countries without extraterritorial protection, such as the Russians, Germans, and Austrians, seem to have got along well in China, and their experience under Chinese law during the last twenty odd years has not justified the horrors entertained by the conservatives. It is hardly admissible that the nationals of certain countries should enjoy special privileges which are denied to those of other countries.

Ever since the turn of the present century, China has made efforts to get rid of extraterritoriality, but they

have met with little success. In addition to other steps taken, China raised the question of extraterritoriality at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, as well as at the Washington Conference of 1921. Neither attempt, however, brought any tangible results. In 1926 she convened a special Conference at Peking for the specific purpose of reaching an agreement with the interested Powers for the abolition of extraterritoriality, as did Egypt at Montreux this year; but the result of the Peking Conference was totally different from that at Montreux. Three years later, that is in 1929, China stated her case before the League of Nations; but, as elsewhere, received no satisfaction. Her experience is that, in principle, all nations invariably express sympathy with her aspirations, but in practice no nation seems eager to go far enough to translate its sympathy into action. Several of the leading Powers, as long ago as 1900, promised in principle to relieve China of her extraterritorial burdens, but little progress has been made so far.

Great Britain is the only important country that has taken some forward steps to express her good will, as shown by the return of her concessions at Hankow, Kiukiang, and Wei-hai-wei. It goes without saying that her friendly gesture is appreciated. But as Great Britain was the first to introduce extraterritoriality into China, so perhaps the Chinese look to Great Britain to be the first to help her terminate that system.

Being disappointed and mortified again and again, China was compelled to feel that it was hopeless to wait for all the interested Powers to agree voluntarily to the abolition of extraterritoriality. Therefore, after much deliberation her Government decided upon unilateral abolition and issued a Mandate on Dec. 28, 1929, to the effect that, beginning on Jan. 1, 1930, 'all foreigners in China, who are now enjoying extraterritorial privileges, shall abide by the laws, ordinances, and regulations duly promulgated by the central and local Governments of China.' On account of the opposition of some of the leading Powers and in consideration of her internal weakness, however, China had to postpone the enforcement of that abolitionist mandate. It is evident, however, that the postponement was made reluctantly and the writing

on the wall seems to be clear that if the Powers move too slowly in the matter they may be again confronted with China's denunciation of the extraterritorial clauses in the treaties.

It is only natural that the abolition of the Capitulations in Egypt has intensified Chinese feelings against the continuation of extraterritoriality. The press and the public bodies are becoming more vociferous in calling for unilateral abolition. While expressing sympathy with many of the abolitionist arguments, we must emphasise the need of proper caution. In the first place it must be remembered that the fault for the introduction of extraterritoriality does not entirely rest on the nations which claim the privilege, and it must be understood that the abolition of an institution of such long standing would involve inconveniences for those whose business is built on its foundations. In spite of the reasonableness of the Chinese case it must be borne in mind that there are other international questions of far more seriousness, and therefore, questions of less importance must not be permitted to interfere with the handling of those of greater moment. Perhaps I can best explain my thoughts by telling what happened last year at the International League of Nations Union Conference.

One day when the Council was discussing Japan's invasion of Manchuria a certain delegate suddenly challenged me with the question, Why should we blame Japan for her occupation of Manchuria and not blame the Soviet for her occupation of Outer Mongolia? Being caught unawares and realising that any adequate explanation would be too long and, therefore, unsatisfactory, I had to put to my challenger a counter-question: If the gentleman on my left should step on my toe and the gentleman on my right should wield a knife in trying to cut my throat, would not both instinct and wisdom compel me to ward off him with the knife and meanwhile, make no complaint of the pain inflicted on my toe? The parable answered admirably, as shown in the satisfaction expressed by the audience and the challenger. The same reasoning should also hold good in the extraterritoriality case. No doubt its shackles are painful and harmful, but we Chinese must not handle this question in such a way as to interfere with what even more threatens our

national life. We must realise that our weakness and recurring civil wars, perhaps, have as much influence as foreign opposition in preventing the termination of extraterritoriality ; while a strong united government will be a shorter cut to the Chinese goal than abolitionist slogans.

On the other hand, foreign Powers also should recognise that extraterritoriality deprives China of one of the essential attributes of sovereignty and seriously interferes with her progress. 'This régime,' to use the French delegate's words at Montreux in May, 1937, 'has crystallised itself into a system of intolerable privileges which a nation conscious of its sovereignty could no longer put up with.' What is true regarding Egypt must be equally true regarding China. Therefore, both China and the interested Powers must be open-minded enough to try to find some reasonable and speedy means for the solution of this complicated problem in a manner that will honour the legitimate interests of all concerned and be conducive to a better mutual understanding and good will.

CHING-CHUN WANG.

Art. 6.—‘VICTORIA REGINA,’ 1837–1937.

THIS *annus mirabilis*, now drawing to its close, has been in itself a striking celebration of the Centenary of the reign of the great Queen who ascended the throne of England one hundred years ago. The coronation and consecration of Queen Victoria's great-grandson in May last, with all its attendant circumstances of poignancy and pageantry, its concentration upon the person of a young monarch called out of due time to take upon himself the cares and responsibilities of the Head of the State, the appealing figure of his beautiful Queen Consort at his side, inevitably turned the thoughts of his British subjects back to the early morning in June 1837 which saw the birth of the glorious reign that has come to be known as the Victorian Era, which closed at the beginning of the present century. Is history repeating itself? The England known to King George's Hanoverian predecessors owed everything that was good to the Elizabethan period; his Majesty may feel prompted to say, in the same broad sense, that the Empire which he knows owes everything to the Victorian age. For, during those sixty years and after, the British Empire, well and truly built on wide and sure foundations, again survived grave domestic turmoils within, tumults and wars without—a prouder boast than many countries can claim—and still reverently glories in its unshaken loyalty to the Throne upon which sits the personification of the British Constitution. Every day, one might say every night as we sleep, that marvellous, wise, illogical, and political organism is ‘broadening down from precedent to precedent,’ marching in perfect step beside the just expression of a people's will. This is entirely in accord with and based upon Victorian tradition; for it must be recognised and remembered that, before Queen Victoria's accession, our Hanoverian rulers knew nothing and cared less about our British Constitution, our British policy, our British history. They were in almost permanent opposition to the British Governments of their days, and too idle or incompetent to study or understand the mentality of the nation over which they reigned.

In this atmosphere of hostility to British institutions the Princess Victoria was brought up by her German

parents, powerfully supported by two imported aliens, her governess, Baroness Lehzen, and Baron Stockmar, her tutor, whose interfering relations with British Ministers in questions of domestic and foreign policy were insufferable then and would not be tolerated for a moment to-day. It is not unnatural, therefore, that in the early days of her reign the young Queen adhered to the *sic volo, sic jubeo* attitude of her forbears, with resultant clashes between her Majesty and her Ministers. It is unnecessary to speculate upon how long this unhappy state of affairs might have continued ; but let us never forget, among the many great services which he rendered to our country, that it was the Prince Consort whose political sense ultimately freed Britain from the shackles of the 'Coburg Trust' and, by his charm and intuition, guided his Queen to accept all the implications of the British Constitution over which she presided. From the hour of that change in her political outlook and of the applied development of her untiring industry and common sense we may date the real beginning of the Victorian era.

A well-known Chinese proverb declares that 'no family can look forward to posterity which does not look backward to its ancestors.' Shall we not take to heart the truth of that saying—we who believe ourselves to be among the privileged spectators of the unfolding of the doors that will show us the vision of a new era perhaps even more illustrious than any that has gone before ? The task is a grateful and an easy one, limiting it, for the purpose of this meditation, to the reign of Queen Victoria alone. Biographies, histories, and diaries have been left (unread ?) upon the bookshelves of our private and public libraries for many a long day. But, within the last few years, as though in preparation for a popular recognition of her centenary, many authors seem to have conspired to produce a number of interesting volumes concerning the life of Queen Victoria written from every conceivable angle. Possibly Lytton Strachey was the pioneer in making her Majesty a 'best seller,' with his admirable book which, although entitled 'Queen Victoria,' was to some readers more interesting as a sympathetic and penetrating study of Prince Albert. Then, without any respect for chronological sequence, we welcomed Sir John Marriott's volume on 'Queen Victoria and her Ministers,'

written in his grand manner and indicating the processes which led her to treat her Ministers not as enemies but friends, in spite of her insurmountable preferences and antipathies. Miss Edith Sitwell, too, and Mr Guedalla have provided us with intimate and lively portraits in the style of Winterhalter's 'conversation pieces,' giving a surprising amount of interesting information possibly overlooked by other writers. From a more privileged pen, that of the late Sir Frederick Ponsonby, who was brought up in the royal household and served three monarchs, we have a delightful series of 'Sidelights on Queen Victoria' which probably no other man could have done so well. Other angles of vision are supplied by Mr Vaughan Wilkins in 'And so—Victoria,' an Hogarthian picture of her Majesty's immediate family in the days of her extreme youth and of their unsavoury old age; and by Mr Crabites, a writer who has made a special study of Baron Stockmar in a volume which he has called 'Victoria's Guardian Angel,' and which says all that can be said in defence of that able and astute busybody, who was despatched by King Leopold of the Belgians first of all to observe the Princess Victoria's conduct in the nursery and finally to appear as the *Eminence Grise* of the Prince Consort and the *bête noire* of British Cabinets.

And, during all this time, another author was quietly publishing, at frequent intervals, a delightful little series of 'Palace Plays,' delicate trifles of fact and fancy, portraying Queen Victoria, her friends and her foibles, her pastimes and her Prime Ministers, with a certain charm that is all his own. It is difficult to give adequate expression of one's gratitude to Mr Laurence Housman for this first-class budget of literary etchings, now fortunately gathered into two volumes with the happy titles of 'Victoria Regina' and 'The Golden Sovereign.' With artistry and uncanny intuition he has given us special perceptions and appreciations of the chief personages that occupied our political and social stage during those memorable years. We need not stop to consider whether Mr Housman's craftsmanship is more brilliantly apparent in his delineation of character, in his gift of dialogue, or in his power of suggesting an adventure or a situation. It is sufficient to recommend both of these books to a generation that talks easily enough about 'early Victorians'

but will find itself richer for the knowledge of the period that Mr Housman can give them.

One criterion of a good book is that the reader closes it with a sigh and wishes that there were more of it. We can predict that such will be the reaction of the majority of readers to 'Victoria Regina' when its last page is reached. And a number of murmurings will be heard, not in criticism but in genuine disappointment—'What a pity he could not bring in the visit to Ireland'; or, 'How little there was in the book about the home life of the Queen with her children after the Prince Consort's death'; or, 'It would have been interesting to read Mr Housman on those long, dark years of the Queen's widowhood, when her persistent refusal to appear in public was so universally condemned'; or, 'What interesting portraits the author could have given us of "Lehzen" and Baron Stockmar, who both counted for so much in the upbringing both of the Queen and Prince Albert in the best traditions of a German court.' We must imagine that so charming an author could immediately agree that all these subjects would have been most agreeable to write about, but that much material in so long a reign had to be sacrificed unless the book were to become of a length too heavy to hold or to read. The truth perhaps is that, if we have enjoyed an author's work, we are apt to regret that it did not contain more of what we wanted, written in the same style that delighted us; forgetting that a book should not exceed four hundred and fifty pages (this is a somewhat arbitrary figure) and that the whole story of a play must be compacted into less than three hours.

Which brings us to a crucial question, based on this very difficulty of selection, Is it possible to make a satisfactory play out of so good a book as 'Victoria Regina'? It was beautifully produced in France and afterwards in England; and we joyfully admit to having spent two delightful evenings at the Theatre de la Madeleine and at the Lyric Theatre in London watching the (very different) dramatised versions of Mr Housman's studies. In both cases the managements can have had little to complain of in the matter of public encouragement and support; but it is curious to note that, whereas the French audiences were entirely satisfied with M. Maurois' daring experiment in adaptation, they thought the English version was dull.

On the other hand, English visitors, whilst admiring the elegance of the French version and the perfect acting of Mademoiselle Gaby Morlay and of Jacques Irwen, declared that the original play was robbed of all its Anglo-German atmosphere and might have been a *comédie de mœurs* at the Court of Louis Philippe. For as such it was played by the talented French company, who acquitted themselves with the natural vivacity that one associates with ladies and gentlemen in the French drawing-rooms of that period. But, la! what consternation and dismay if such had been the tempo of the Court of Queen Victoria! 'We' would not have been amused. For 'Our' Court was made of sterner stuff, quite unrecognisable among such elegant fripperies. 'We' were succeeding by slow degrees in purging Society, through the Court, of the grosser features of an earlier reign of excess and extravagance, whose ravages were only diminished as the sons of King George III were providentially gathered to their fathers, an example that was followed with commendable rapidity by their mistresses and their wives. To them succeeded an Age of Innocence, banishing strong language and strong drink to the servants' hall; yet preserving, both in London and Windsor, the respectable rigidity so dear to the hearts of Queen Victoria's family and visitors until a date so recent that many still alive can recall traces of it. It must be conceded that to have transplanted the drab atmosphere of such a British Court to the stage of a French Theatre would have made for immediate disaster.

We hazard the suggestion that successful transplantation of this kind, not only from one language but also from one mentality into another, presupposes that mutual affinity and understanding between two countries which alone produces a fruitful soil for drama in translation. Let us admit the truth of this dictum and apply it to the present case. May it not be possible to find an expert adapter who, after reading Housman, might be inspired to plan 'Victoria Regina' for one of the leading theatres in Germany? The material is abundant; the affinity is there; the translation would be safe in the hands of a nation that has made the plays of Shakespeare as popular in Germany as they are in England. And the period, especially the latter half of it, happens to have been one

of absorbing interest not only to Great Britain but also to the concatenation of minor kingdoms and principalities which ultimately became the German Empire. From such an adaptation great things could be expected, varying the selection of incidents and persons to be presented to meet German requirements. And this expectation is aroused not only from the existence of the premises already given but by the lesson of past experience which shows (though inversely) that a large number of plays adapted from German authors and their Scandinavian cousins have 'come to stay' in England, whereas very few French dramatic works, either classical or contemporary, meet with much acceptance from the British public.

But we must desist from further pursuit of such speculations upon dramatic enterprise in other countries, interesting though they be, and return to the more immediate topic of M. Maurois' charming comedy. As has been said already, we cannot quarrel with any foreign adapter who selects for inclusion in his play only such episodes, out of an *embarras de choix*, as appear to his experience to be most sure of appeal to the taste of his audiences. But we may be allowed to wonder what M. Maurois, the most recent writer of a History of England, is going to say to M. Maurois the adapter of this play when he notices the inclusion of certain trivial incidents as being typical or important in the reign of the great Queen and the strange omission to present any of the statesmen whose influence and character made her great—with the exception of Lord Melbourne, who holds the stage for a few brief moments in an early scene. Not a word about Palmerston or Gladstone, or even about Disraeli who (apart from his other claims to be noticed) might be expected to have had sufficient theatrical value to merit the attention of a playwright. To us such names are inseparable from the Victorian era; but we must be prepared to hear that, perhaps with the exception of Lord Palmerston, none of these important men mean anything to the present generation of French playgoers. And who are we to resent such an argument; we who could scarcely hope to pass an easy examination upon the names of the statesmen of any country except our own? But when it comes to presenting the play in its original form in New York, then we are indeed surprised to learn that Disraeli and all other

British statesmen were omitted from the first edition. There must be some reason for so remarkable a conspiracy of silence; and until the reason is vouchsafed to us we are at liberty to think that a play about Victoria without the appearance of any of her Prime Ministers must be to us as historically incomplete as would be a play about the foundation of the German Empire which excluded the monumental figures of Bismarck and Moltke, or a drama based on the American War of Independence that ignored the personality of George Washington. The Queen would appear to have been presented to those early audiences as a second Minerva, armed cap-à-pie from the beginning of her reign with all the necessary apparatus of governance at her command, and going on from strength to strength without any external assistance; they were invited to gaze, as it were, upon a Dome of Majesty, an Arch of Triumph suspended by no golden cord from heaven, supported by no solid columns rooted in the earth; upon a child phenomenon shining in the political firmament, a miracle of precocious wisdom hitherto unknown to history. But, in fact, the personality and the career of Queen Victoria admit of a far easier explanation. Her Dome of Majesty was firmly pillared and buttressed throughout her long reign, not only by 'my good and honest friend Stockmar' but by the collective wisdom and tactful influence of the Prime Ministers who served her.

In reply, we may perhaps be told that we are taking Mr Housman's work too seriously, and that when he and his adapters set out on their enterprising dramatic journey in search of Victoria it was without any intention to present their fellow countrymen with a centenary edition of a biography, but merely to provide a coruscating 'Cavalcade' for an evening's entertainment. If that be the answer, it is a complete one, and there is no more to be said—except this: that, in the opinion of many, the book is of real historical value, a *chef d'œuvre* of its kind, and as such it will stand the test of time; whereas the play seems to lack the foundation upon which Victoria's character was built. For in order to realise the principles that guided and the strength that governed in that great reign, it is essential that we should take careful note of the fact that, in her early years, the Queen was 'as moderately equipped intellectually as the average girl'; and, as the

late Lord Esher goes on to remark, 'her mind, at the opening of her reign, was a blank page in so far as questions of high politics or of administration were concerned'; then we should endeavour to ascertain whose were the hands which wrote upon that *tabula rasa* one of the finest pages in British history. Surely they were the hands of those distinguished statesmen who were about the Queen's path and about her bed from her tender beginning to the end of her life; who, having frustrated the teutonic efforts of some who were 'spying out all her ways,' set themselves, a long line of British Prime Ministers, to teach their monarch, already gifted with abounding common sense, a fine morale, and more than ordinary intuition, the principles of the Constitution which must be obeyed by all whose ambition it is to govern the British Empire with success.

Finally, after this modest attempt to gild an already rare and beautiful lily, let us turn our attention to the production at the Lyric Theatre which, by graceful arrangement, coincided in date with the centenary of the day on which (in the language of Queen Victoria's Accession Service) 'her Majesty began her happy reign.' And here, in passing, a word of congratulation to British dramatic art in general and to a wise and liberal-minded Lord Chamberlain in particular, that, as a Coronation gift to the public, the Censor of plays has lifted a long superannuated embargo and restored to the stage (with certain necessary limitations) the liberty to represent royal personages on the boards of the Theatre. For how long that liberty may be enjoyed will depend upon the use that is made of it by authors and producers. But one fact is beyond cavil, that in 'Victoria Regina' we have a brilliant and impressive example of how this new right should be exercised. If it be wisely and intelligently followed, Lord Cromer will have no reason to regret that he has delivered our dramatic art in all its connotations from an agelong thralldom.

The play, as produced in London, was worthy of the book and of its venerable subject. If we agree that Mr Housman has an uncanny genius for assimilating the mentality and the manners of the men and the women about whom he writes, the same praise will be given to Mr Rex Whistler for the accurate beauty of his 'designs' from the first scene to the last. Such a combination of

delicate dialogue with rich costumes and the best Victorian setting inspired a brilliant cast of artists to present unfalteringly the personages and statesmen and courtiers who lived and moved and had their being at Buckingham Palace, Windsor Castle, and Balmoral in the spacious days of the great Queen. Would that this were the place in which to praise in turn all those who afforded us so much pleasure! Miss Stanley, in the title-role, gave a marvellous impersonation of Victoria—whose accent we fear never, even until the end of her life, approached the Oxford purity of this young actress's enunciation. Mr Allan Aynesworth as Lord Conyngham, in a stately disguise, resurrected vivid memories of the late Lord Chaplin; the two foreign princes confounded us with a fluent and impeccable broken English that has never been approached on the English stage; and all the other members of a large company must understand that only the exigencies of space prevent us from offering them more than 'most honourable mention.' But let none of them ever forget, whatever the future may have in store, that collectively they have played an important part in recapturing for the present generation something of the true atmosphere of the England of a hundred memorable years.

A Persian proverb runs 'Praise the sun *at evening*,' suggesting thereby that we should wait until the sunset to assess whatever good or harm it may have done within the past twenty-four hours before offering to it an indiscriminate hymn of thanksgiving. We need therefore have no scruples to-day in laying our burnt-offerings of gratitude upon the altar of the Victorian era, the latter years of which some of us remember with pride, and upon whose prestige all of us are, consciously or unconsciously, living still. Since those days what cataracts of water have passed under British bridges to the ocean of past history, bearing with them a burden which it may be impossible to analyse, but leaving behind a residue of wisdom and calm sense, of reverence for law and order, that has produced a congenial soil for the cultivation of British influence throughout the far-flung dominions of the Crown. Not a wrack of remembrance is left of Hanoverian politics and manners, of imported kings whose nature it was to rule although they were only chosen to reign; of burdens of taxation, imposed by a Parliament of *élites* elected on a

restricted franchise but paid in the main by an unrepresented multitude, and spent to a very large extent on mercenaries for foreign wars in which, under different dynastic conditions, we might never have become entangled. These things passed away with the House of Hanover, never to return. But, from the fertile residue deposited by the floods of time, there sprang a more British sense of government and of parliamentary institutions ; a harvest of wider sympathies and of wise emancipations from outworn tradition, of considerate legislation for the benefit of all classes. The resultant peace and happiness throughout the land developed inventive genius, increased commercial activity, stimulated the pursuit of the arts, and encouraged the virtues of family life. It is of these things that we sing when we praise the 'land of hope and glory' bequeathed to us by Queen Victoria. And we have survived to recognise that she and her statesmen builded on even surer foundations than they knew : foundations capable of bearing the heavy burden of a world-wide Empire and its vast responsibilities, a monument of political architecture which has been cemented and reinforced by the progressive policies of our rulers and statesmen in the succeeding years, a goodly heritage indeed for those who come after.

È finita la storia Victoriana ; but its spirit is omnipresent on every ocean and in every continent of the world. What a field of investigation for Mr Housman in his search for further sidelights on contemporary history ! We say this advisedly, in grateful anticipation of favours to come, to the man who has whetted our appetites so keenly that we cannot refrain from asking for more. More about Queen Victoria ; something about King Edward and his adventures in the regions of diplomacy ; of King George and Queen Mary and their magic hold upon the hearts of their subjects in every corner of the Empire. Human memory is so constituted that the important events of the day-before-yesterday are far less easily remembered than those which occurred in our childhood. Let us adjure Mr Housman, by the power of his pen, to see to it that they are not forgotten. To his hands we confidently entrust the preparation of further volumes that shall be the apostolic successors of 'Victoria Regina.'

IAN MALCOLM.

Art. 7.—STATE INTERVENTION IN INDUSTRY.

THE problem of the State's part in economic life has been frequently debated since the day when John Stuart Mill devoted the last section of his 'Principles of Political Economy' to this subject. But the problem is not hackneyed, because, with changes in economic circumstances and in the political outlook, it takes on a new form from decade to decade and needs continual restatement. It does not lend itself easily to scientific discussion, for it involves both political and economic considerations; and in controversy these two aspects are often confused, so that a judgment which has really been determined by political opinion is made to appear as though it were a conclusion derived from a process of economic reasoning. Now no one will contend that economic doctrine itself enables us to decide whether this or that action by the State in the economic field is justifiable or not. A judgment of that nature must depend upon many factors outside the province of economics. For example, those who hold the views of the early Radicals, who believed that the State's functions should be limited to providing a sound currency, enforcing contracts, and defining property-rights, naturally deal with any question of intervention not upon economic grounds but in the light of their own philosophy. On the other hand, those who regard the profit-motive as unworthy or the wage-contract as incompatible with the dignity of man, are likely—again for non-economic reasons—to be in favour of a wide extension of public control. Persons with strong political convictions such as these are often indifferent to the economic aspect of problems. Their judgments do not emerge from an economic analysis of the issue under discussion, but are in fact pre-determined. Even those persons who take full account of the economic aspect may regard that aspect as of secondary importance, and if they do so the economist has no quarrel with them provided that the true grounds for the judgment are clearly indicated. But the fact that economic considerations are generally not decisive in questions of this kind does not mean that economics has nothing to offer to the discussion of them. Frequently a pseudo-economic argument is put forward to justify a

policy which really derives its driving-force from quite other motives, and so the economist has the task of defining the issues involved and of showing how far the decision may be justified on purely economic grounds.

It is, of course, not possible here to deal with the whole vast question of the State's part in economic life. This article will be concerned merely with certain aspects of intervention that have been prominent in recent years, chiefly with the efforts of the Government to determine the structure and organisation of industry. This is not a new field of State activity. For instance, for years past in most countries governments have had a definite attitude towards industrial combinations, an attitude which has been expressed in their legislation. In pre-War Germany the law and public opinion were favourably disposed towards cartels and combinations in restraint of trade; while in pre-War America the Government made determined efforts to break up large combinations and to preserve competitive conditions. Our own Government took a mid-way course; but its economic policy was, on the whole, unfavourable to the creation of monopolies, and public opinion regarded them with hostility. Within recent years, however, the question has assumed great prominence in this country, as elsewhere, because the State has abandoned its traditional policy and has been actively encouraging particular forms of organisation within several of the staple trades. In transport, in several branches of agriculture, in the coal, iron and steel, and cotton industries, and in fishing it has intervened with the deliberate purpose of calling into existence a form of organisation different from that worked out by business men engaged in those industries, and this new form involves concentration of control and often the establishment of a complete monopoly.

To explain this change in policy one can point to the depression which has threatened the existence of a great part of several leading industries. Many of them are among those which are considered to be especially important from a political standpoint or those in which decay has created serious social problems. Government attention has been attracted to coal-mining largely because its plight has led to heavy localised unemployment. Support has been given to shipping and agriculture

because those industries are associated with national prestige and defence, and with a way of life and a type of skill that are believed to be particularly valuable to the community's social and political experience. Thus intervention has not arisen out of a general desire to raise the level of economic efficiency; its direction has not been determined by the fact that the organisation of some trades has failed to satisfy a criterion of effectiveness, but by political and social reasons. The State has wished for such reasons to maintain some industries at a certain size or to keep the incomes of wage-earners or profit-earners in other industries above the level which is warranted by the economic conditions of those industries. The State has several means for achieving these ends. It may grant a subsidy to a decaying industry; it may increase that industry's competitive strength in the home market by imposing a duty on imports; it may help to create a monopolistic organisation which enables those concerned in the trade to get higher incomes, or which sometimes facilitates the spreading of employment. Finally, it may rationalise the industry, i.e. it may promote a form of industrial combination which will permit costs to be reduced. It is over the last two methods that confusion is likely to arise. For both of them involve the concentration of control in the industry; and to the outsider the form of organisation appropriate to one purpose may be indistinguishable from the form appropriate to the other, and quite different, purpose. Moreover, the great combine which the State may have promoted with the object of securing reductions in costs may use its power over the market, once it has been created, to exact higher prices and neglect to introduce the economies which the new organisation is supposed to make possible.

Intervention which creates monopoly and leads to higher prices cannot be condemned as immoral. The poet tells us that when Divine Justice left the earth her last steps were among the farmers. Economists cannot claim that the State is mistaken when it acts in such a way as to raise the price of bacon and so to increase the incomes of pig-breeders, whose qualities are presumably so much more attractive to the Divinity than those of chocolate manufacturers or accountants. That is a question of values and is outside the province of economics.

But the economist can attempt to measure the cost of the action to the community as a whole. He can also demand that the motives leading to the intervention shall be clearly expressed and that the issue shall not be obscured by appeals to pseudo-economic arguments in justification for the action. The quaint assumption of many of the Agricultural Marketing Boards that a rise in price will leave the quantity of demand unchanged may rightly be exposed by him. Again, it is sometimes said, perhaps with justice, that a country with a population divided equally among agriculture, manufacturing industry, and commerce has a better-balanced and more varied *social* life than a country which is more highly specialised. But this argument is often illegitimately carried over into economics, and there it emerges as the proposition that the first type of country possesses a more stable *economic* system than the other type, because the markets of agriculture and manufactures are reciprocal. This, however, is true of any groups of industries. The income that accrues to those engaged in the cotton industry is available for the purchase of coal, metal goods, and so on, just as is that of agriculturalists; while the income of persons in the coal trade is used for buying manufactured goods no less than for buying agricultural products.

Still, while economic reasoning may be employed to refute pseudo-economic arguments that have been advanced in favour of particular schemes of organisation, and to expose the true nature of the schemes, it cannot challenge the social and political motives and arguments which are usually behind them. Often people wonder why governments have persistently followed economic policies which expert economic opinion has condemned. No satisfactory reply has been given to the expert criticisms, and yet political action has remained unaffected by them. This is because economists and politicians have conducted their disputations on different planes of thought. The economists have directed their criticism against the feeble economic arguments that have been put forward to justify certain acts of intervention of the kind here under discussion; but they have failed to see that those arguments are merely a cloak for the real reasons, which are political and social in character. Their criticism, therefore, seems irrelevant to the

politicians. It may be asked why a cloak has been considered necessary. This is probably because in the past economic policy has usually been discussed in terms of costs and proceeds. So, even to-day, when economic considerations are no longer held to be paramount, politicians cast their arguments in an economic form. The result is to confuse the real issues and divert expert criticism to aspects of the problem that seem to the Government relatively unimportant.

So far the argument has gone to show that the *direction* of State intervention is determined by political and social reasons, and not by economic reasons, and that often the form of organisation that is created by the State is due to those reasons also. But in imposing a new form of organisation on an industry, the Government has frequently declared that, besides improving the incomes of the members of those industries, the scheme will bring about a reduction of costs and so benefit the community. In other words, the schemes have usually been defended on economic grounds. It is true that up to the present their success from this point of view has not been striking; but are we to conclude that State action cannot effect any improvement in an industry's organisation? Are the planners, who think that costs might be reduced if the structure of every industry were rationalised, hopeless engaged? This is a question that can be examined in isolation—without the intrusion of politics.

There is in every trade at a particular time a certain scale of operations and a certain form of organisation that are the most appropriate for that trade. The scale and form for one trade are likely to be unsatisfactory for another, as they are determined by many factors which differ from industry to industry—the size of the market and the nature of demand, the technique of production and marketing, the nature of the raw material supplies and the labour supply, and the kind of management that is required, to mention the most obvious. Under competition the organisation appropriate to the peculiar conditions in each industry will be worked out by the business men concerned with it. Although the ideally best organisation may not be attained in any trade, yet business men who are least successful in their efforts to approach it will fail to sustain themselves in competition

with the others. So the most efficient scale and form of organisation are not matters to be determined arbitrarily or worked out from general principles—they have to be arrived at by people actually engaged in each industry by reference to changing conditions of demand and technique. Almost every trade has some peculiarities which force it to develop a type of organisation in some respects different from that of the rest. Further, as conditions are always altering, the most appropriate form of organisation in any trade changes from time to time.

It may sometimes happen that industries fail to adjust their organisation to a change in conditions or that the process of adjustment is too slow for the maintenance of the previous standard of efficiency. For example, some contend that the preservation of independent organisations on the manufacturing and marketing sides of the Lancashire cotton industry has made it very difficult to bring about the reduction of costs necessary to meet post-War conditions. The merchants, it is said, try to maintain themselves against the growing fierceness of competition by ordering fabrics with slight differences of weave and design. This has an unfortunate effect on weaving and finishing costs, because it is impossible to obtain long runs when there are innumerable varieties of product. The total business of the cotton industry is less than it would otherwise be on account of the trade's unsatisfactory structure. It is curious that this defect is usually attributed to excessive competition, when it actually arises because competitive forces are acting imperfectly in the trade; that is to say, it is due to the intrusion of monopolistic elements. In other industries, also, in which demand has been reduced and a contraction has occurred, costs are kept up, so it is claimed, by the goodwill which each of the firms possesses, because this delays the concentration of output on the firms that are technically the most efficient. In such cases there appear to be grounds for State intervention for the purpose of hastening the adjustment of industry to meet the new conditions. To this principle there can be few objections.

It is, however, in the application of the principle to particular cases that difficulties arise. If the Government is to plan the organisation of an industry, how is it to obtain the knowledge that may enable it to determine the

content of the plan? The substitution of planning for *laissez-faire* in this sphere will be to no advantage if the planned form is less efficient than the old one. The appropriate form cannot be deduced from general principles, since it differs in each industry according to technical and other conditions peculiar to that industry. It is highly unlikely that persons outside the industry can discover a form more efficient than that worked out by men who have spent their lives in running it. It has been suggested that the general trend of industrial organisation at home and abroad may provide some guide to administrators. Yet there seems little reason for supposing that because some industries have been successfully conducted by large combinations, other industries, which have not hitherto moved in that direction, may benefit by being forced to do so. The refusal of the latter to adopt a trustified form may be completely justified by the technical and marketing conditions. It has also been suggested that the judgment of industrial leaders should be regarded as a sanction for re-organisation schemes. If the chief manufacturers in any industry are in favour of a particular scheme, cannot the State conclude that it might with advantage be enforced over all of them? Many planners would agree with this; others would prefer to put the point in a rather different way and affirm that the State is justified in enforcing on an industry the form of organisation that the majority of its members want. At first sight this seems a reasonable answer; but it may be challenged from several points of view.

The proposed change in organisation, since it is designed to meet the troubles of a whole industry, usually involves [the concentration of control—the establishment of an authority possessed of some degree of monopolistic power, such as the Marketing Boards in agriculture or the price associations affiliated to the British Iron and Steel Federation. In other words, a scheme never, in practice, involves merely the adjustment of organisation to enable the industry to increase its efficiency within the framework of existing market conditions; the scheme leads also to a change in these market conditions themselves—the substitution of monopoly for competition in many instances. Thus, business men, when giving their approval to a proposed rationalisation scheme, are not so

much concerned with it as a method by which costs can be reduced. They fully recognise the fact that the new organisation may enable them to take advantage of the more favourable market conditions that the institution of monopoly will create for them. For some years before 1932 the Government, which was apparently convinced of the economies to be derived from rationalisation, had been pressing the members of the iron and steel industry to form large combinations; but little movement in this direction took place until the imposition of heavy import duties in 1932 freed the industry from foreign competition in the home-market and so provided manufacturers with greater opportunities for monopolistic exploitation.

There is another objection to the view that the opinions of the leaders or of the majority in an industry should be decisive. In every trade there are firms working at different levels of efficiency, and usually the more efficient are in process of absorbing the business of the others. A scheme for rationing output in agreed proportions (usually determined by past experience) may recommend itself to the majority because it will help them in their competition with rivals of outstanding efficiency. If majority rule is allowed to decide, such a scheme may be imposed on the industry against the wishes of the few; but this will clearly be to the disadvantage of the community, because it will impede the transference of demand to the more efficient (i.e. the lower-cost) sources of supply. If, on the other hand, the leaders are allowed to exert the greatest influence, other difficulties may arise. The leaders in a trade are those in control of the largest and most prominent firms. But these firms are not always the most progressive, and so their directors' interests may lie in checking the development of new and enterprising firms, and they will be likely to support a scheme which helps them to do this.

The difficulty of defining an industry is another source of confusion. Firms that are generally considered to form part of the same industry are often engaged in very different processes or types of manufactures. The organisation suitable to one branch of the trade may be inappropriate to another, because of the different technical and marketing conditions under which they operate. It is significant that the opposition to the iron and steel

scheme came mainly from firms doing special types of products. Thus, of the six members of the executive committee who opposed the scheme put forward by the iron and steel trade in 1933, three were producers of foundry iron and one was a wrought-iron manufacturer, who were all faced with very different problems from those with which the great concerns producing steel-making iron and ingot steel had to deal. It might seem easy to exclude firms of this kind from a general scheme ; but as one branch of a trade shades into another, it is always very difficult to decide where the line of exclusion is to be drawn. A firm may demand to be allowed to stand outside a scheme not so much because its technical and marketing problems are really different from those of the rest of the industry (though that will be the ostensible reason), but because it hopes to take advantage of the higher prices that are anticipated from the operation of the scheme and at the same time to be free to extend its output without the restrictions to which the others will be subjected. An outsider can seldom say whether the objections to inclusion in a scheme are legitimate or not.

So far the discussion has been confined to cases in which the business leaders or the majority of the manufacturers are in favour of a State-enforced scheme. What is to be thought of State intervention when it takes the form of imposing on an industry a form of organisation of which the vast majority of the members disapprove ? This has happened in the coal industry. Is such action always to be condemned on economic grounds ? Where strong opposition of this kind exists, the Government obviously ought to act with caution ; but the scheme is not necessarily to be condemned for such a reason. Business men act from a variety of motives. Manufacturers in industries in which there is a strong individualistic tradition may sometimes object to a scheme merely because it involves compulsion by the Government or what they consider to be an unjustifiable interference with property rights. The opposition in the coal trade to the proposals of the Coal Mines Re-organisation Commission seems to be based on a dislike of the compulsion with which they are associated rather than on a disbelief in the advantages of large combined concerns. Sometimes business men may approve of a particular scheme that is put up to them by

the Government, but may fear that it is the forerunner of legislation which will deprive them ultimately of the control of their industry, and they may oppose the scheme for that reason. Again, in large companies management is in the hands of men who have no substantial investments in those companies, and the expressed attitude of the firms to a rationalisation scheme may be influenced by other considerations than economy or financial success. Those in control of some firms may favour a scheme not because it will be for the benefit of the trade as a whole but because it may help them to extend their administrative range and so satisfy their ambitions. On the other hand, others may oppose a scheme, even if it is likely to benefit their shareholders or the public, because they fear that they might lose their jobs if a consolidation of firms were effected.

If a decision cannot be left wholly to the business men themselves, cannot the Government take the advice of an impartial tribunal or commission which hears evidence from all parties? The efficiency of this method may be doubted. The analogy of the law-courts is misleading, owing to the absence of any objective standards which can be applied to test the efficiency of different kinds of organisation. So long as the competitive market exists, of course, there is a rough-and-ready test of the relative efficiency of each firm. But when competitive conditions are drastically modified or abolished (as happens under a rationalisation scheme), then the objective test disappears. In a law-court the judge has to apply a definite body of principles to the cases brought before him. Even on a tribunal like a Trade Board the task of the chairman and the other appointed members is fairly straight-forward, for they are guided in judging whether wage-rates in a particular trade should be altered by such objective tests as movements in the cost-of-living index and by what is happening to wages in other industries. Further, the Trade Board adjudicator takes the wage system and the relations between the wages of different grades of workers in each industry as he finds them. He is not called upon to alter the whole structure of the wage system. But the adjudicator in a dispute about rival types of industrial organisation has no such aids or tests, but only the weak presumptions already discussed. The

most important evidence with which he has to deal consists of the opinions of experts engaged in the trade. But these expert witnesses are all interested parties, for their livelihood depends on the way the decision goes, and it cannot be expected that in giving their views they will be influenced primarily by such considerations as the material well-being of the whole community. Yet they alone are competent as a rule to speak on technical matters, and the adjudicator has to remember, before he takes a decision to which most of them are hostile, that it is they who must work whatever scheme is put forward.

During the era of economic liberalism the political authority, while it might set up the institutional and legal framework of the economic system, did not itself venture to take particular decisions about the pricing of goods or the structure of industrial enterprise, except in the case of natural monopolies like public utilities. But now that the State has been compelled to intervene in these matters, those officials or adjudicators who are called upon to make such decisions are naturally inclined, in the absence of other criteria, to apply principles derived from the political sphere to the economic questions which they are expected to answer. Yet a principle which may be satisfactory enough in one sphere of human activity may not be applicable to another. An example may be illuminating. The chairman of a board dealing with a recent scheme that involved State intervention listened to the arguments of the minority group of manufacturers who were hostile to it and admitted that these arguments seemed strong. But as a layman he realised his inability to pit his judgment on a technical question against that of members of the trade. So he gave his decision in favour of the majority's proposal, saying that in a democratic community the majority must decide. This shows an unfortunate confusion between the principles that can be applied in the political and economic spheres. Majority rule is satisfactory in politics because the greater number of those who are consulted, though concerned in the decision as members of a commonwealth, have no intimate and immediate financial interest in the decision as individuals. In other words, majority rule is successful when the issue is of a kind that makes possible disinterested judgments. Moreover, in forming an opinion about a

particular question the citizen is guided by the views of the political party of which he is an adherent, for that party has a body of principles in accordance with which every proposal may be examined. But when the State is trying to decide whether this or that type of organisation is the more efficient for a certain trade, it is faced with an issue that is different in kind from the ordinary political issue. The deciding factor is usually a technical one, and so it is only the men with an expert knowledge of the industry who can form the constituency to which the issue must be referred. Yet all these men have a direct pecuniary interest in the decision that is arrived at, and there is thus no possibility of obtaining judgments which are both informed and disinterested.

A further difficulty should be mentioned. Sometimes intervention may be decided upon in order to meet the troubles of an industry that are of a temporary character, such as may result from a cyclical depression. It may not be at all easy, however, once the structure of a trade has been altered by legislation so as to enable it to meet an emergency, to return to the original form when the emergency has passed. Indeed, the kind of plan that may be satisfactory for dealing with a temporary difficulty may be positively harmful in the long run. An example will clarify this point. Part I of the Coal Mines Act of 1930 provided for the establishment of a Central Council to fix the total output of coal and quotas for different districts, and also District Councils to allocate the district-allowance among the pits and to fix minimum prices. Now this scheme had much to commend it at the time when it was first applied—in the middle of a deep depression. The demand for coal is very inelastic at such times, especially nowadays when export sales depend not merely upon prices but also upon political agreements and quotas instituted by the importing countries. So a scheme for restricting output, spreading it over the different fields and pits, and maintaining prices, might be regarded as a good method of preventing both a further fall in wages and profits and the intensification of localised unemployment. Apart from the cyclical depression, however, the coal industry since the War has been suffering from a chronic decline. To deal with this second problem quite a different policy was needed, a policy that would

lead to the lowering of costs by the closing of high-cost mines and the concentration of production on the most efficient. This process of concentration was in fact taking place before the Coal Mines Act was passed ; but the operation of the Act has apparently checked it and so has actually proved a hindrance to the development of a more efficient organisation. It is true that Part II of the Act set up machinery for dealing with this second problem ; but since its provisions were inconsistent with those of Part I, they could not be applied.

As it is so difficult for a tribunal or commission to make use of the evidence of an economic character that is presented to it, and as it lacks objective tests to apply to alternative forms of organisation, it commonly looks elsewhere for guidance and ends by basing its decision upon grounds that are not economic at all. The decision will usually depend upon the political views or the social philosophy of the members of the commission. The commission may be excused for seeking this way out of its perplexities, since its terms of reference are generally extremely vague. The Government commonly appoints it to inquire into the causes of the depression in an industry and to recommend remedies. But the commission is seldom clearly informed whether it is to advise on the methods by which the organisation of the trade is to be rendered more efficient, or whether it is to show how the size of the trade is to be maintained (or wages and profits increased or employment spread), irrespective of considerations of efficiency and the cost to the community. In other words, it is not told whether it is to make an economic or a political decision. Now although social and political considerations may sometimes, quite properly, be given priority over economic ones, the grounds on which the judgment is based ought to be explicit. A decision which is of a political character ought not to be presented as though it were the result of a process of economic analysis. If it is so presented, as has happened in connection with many important acts of State intervention in industry in recent years, then the real issues are hidden behind a façade of irrelevant discussion. A democracy cannot be expected to make wise judgments if issues are not set before it fairly and honestly.

G. C. ALLEN.

Art. 8.—DR JOHNSON IN EDINBURGH.

CONSIDERING that Johnson spent more than a fortnight in Edinburgh—three days before he started on his tour to the Hebrides and the remainder on his return—his references to the famous city of the north in 'A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland' are, it must be confessed, provocatively meagre. Indeed, the impressions he formed of Edinburgh and the brilliant men and women he met there will be sought in vain in the pages of the 'Journey,' at least in any detail. Nor can much more be said for the letters which he wrote from Scotland to Mrs Thrale—letters which that lady (then Mrs Piozzi) published in 1788, thirteen years after the appearance of her friend's book and three years subsequent to the publication of Boswell's 'Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides.' These shed some rays of light, but it cannot truthfully be asserted that they do justice to what admittedly was one of the richest and most pleasurable experiences of Johnson's sojourn in Scotland.

His stay in Edinburgh was crowded with incident of deep significance; he had not a dull moment, and few in which his acquisitive faculty was not being seriously exercised. And Boswell might be trusted to look after the spectacular aspect. He saw to it that Johnson was feasted and lionised, that he was introduced to the brilliant intellectuals of both sexes who then abode in the Scottish capital, that he was afforded ample opportunity of displaying his conversational powers and in the process getting rid of some of his prejudices, and, finally, that he was shown everything in and around the city worth seeing. Thus it came about that Johnson's experiences in Edinburgh, besides being varied and instructive, were uniformly pleasant. But they were decidedly more than that, for they altered radically his whole attitude towards Scotland and the Scots. Johnson quitted the city with a sense of pleasurable disillusionment, with the conviction that Boswell's countrymen were well within the pale of civilisation. They were not barbarians after all, but people whose mode of life, education, and tastes did not differentiate them essentially from the Sassenach. Furthermore, there was the magnanimous admission that the conversation of the Scots grew 'everyday less unpleas-

ing to the English.' So Johnson departed in a thoroughly charitable frame of mind, with, in fact, 'very grateful feelings' for the hospitality shown him, no less than for the admiration his character and talents had evoked.

Why, then, was this halo of good will not reflected in the pages of the book that Johnson wrote about Scotland? Why should he have been so reticent about an episode of his travels north of the Tweed that unquestionably brought him delight, so remiss in committing to the printed page an experience which, as he admitted quite freely in talking with his friends, had rubbed off the sharp edges of an intensified Anglicism and given him a new point of view? It is difficult to say. Anyhow, it is a fact that the three days spent in Edinburgh before his setting out for the Hebrides, truly memorable for Johnson and, according to his own showing, delightful as well as memorable, are summarily dismissed in the 'Journey' with the mystifying phrase that the city is 'too well known to admit description.' But in whatever guise we view the phrase, we are faced with the peculiar circumstance that Johnson takes leave of his customary volubility and says nothing about the interesting people he met there—William Robertson, the historian, Hugh Blair, whose sermons he extolled so cordially, Lord Hailes, a man after his own heart, Sir William Forbes, the venerable Duchess of Douglas, and the rest. Nor is he more communicative on his return from the Hebrides. All we get is this characteristic piece of Johnsonese: 'We now returned to Edinburgh, where I passed some days with men of learning, whose names want no advancement from my commemoration, or with women of elegance, which perhaps disclaims a pedant's praise.' The pomposity of this passage we would willingly have surrendered for a little more intimacy of touch. No individual mention is made of the group of celebrities with whom he talked and went sightseeing. Confessedly, the intercourse was mutually edifying. The 'men of learning' in Edinburgh were unstinted in their appreciation of the Great Cham, and their cordial feeling was reciprocated, though, somewhat unaccountably, Johnson refrained from making detailed acknowledgment in a book devoted exclusively to narrating a visit to Scotland.

In a letter to Mrs Thrale, written three days after his

arrival in Scotland, we have the only approach to a circumstantial account by Johnson of his doings in Edinburgh. He writes :

On Sunday [Aug. 15] I went to the English chapel. After dinner Dr Robertson came in ; and promised to show me the place [Edinburgh]. On Monday I saw their public buildings. Most are very mean ; and the whole town bears some resemblance to the old part of Birmingham. Boswell has very handsome and spacious rooms, level with the ground on one side of the house and on the other four stories high. At dinner, on Monday, were the Duchess of Douglas, an old lady who talks broad Scotch with a paralytical voice and is scarce understood by her own countrymen.'

'At supper,' Johnson adds, 'there was such a conflux of company that I could scarcely support the tumult'—a sentence which stimulates rather than gratifies curiosity. Now we know from others who were present that this supper at Boswell's house in James's Court was a great occasion, Johnson being in his element and living up to his reputation as a talker. Mrs Sharpe of Hoddam, the mother of Scott's antiquarian friend, witnessed the scene, and tells us that Johnson paid special attention to the old Duchess of Douglas. The great lady wore all her diamonds, though her illiteracy ill-comported with her finery. It is Mrs Sharpe, too, who relates that during the conversation the Duchess administered a rebuff. Happily, Johnson was not allowed to fathom its implication, Boswell taking upon himself the duty of translating 'the unintelligible gaucherie of her ladyship into palatable commonplaces.' Clearly, here was an occasion which lent itself to graphic description, but it is merely an adumbration of it that we get in Johnson's epistle to Mrs Thrale.

The real source of information relating to Johnson's stay in Edinburgh, as of much else connected with the visit of the Great Cham to Scotland, is, of course, Boswell's incomparable 'Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides,' which, although not published till 1785, was almost entirely written while Johnson was trudging the long Scots miles. It has been generally supposed that the fact that the 'Tour' was not published until after Johnson's death rules out the possibility of his having seen the manuscript ; but this is an entire mistake. As a matter of fact, the

'Tour,' in pretty much the form familiar to us, was for the most part written up by Boswell day by day, and Johnson was constantly perusing it during the journey to the Western Islands. Furthermore, Boswell, as early as 1775, forwarded to Johnson a manuscript covering practically the whole book as printed in 1785—a manuscript, it may be added, that Mrs Thrale also read.

But even in the 'Tour,' which displayed Boswell's superlative powers as a biographer long before the 'Life of Johnson' appeared and is in some respects superior to the better known and more imposing masterpiece—even here the account Boswell gives of the Edinburgh days is not so full as we could wish. He was himself conscious of the defects of this section of the 'Tour,' since he deplores having 'kept no journal of anything that passed' during the last nine days of Johnson's residence in the Scottish capital, a default whereby 'a variety of admirable conversation' was lost. Boswell, however, was greatly assisted by a retentive memory, and it is possible from his jottings to reconstruct the picture, at least to some extent. It would be a work of supererogation to recapitulate what has become widely known through the pages of the 'Tour' and the resurvey by Dr Birkbeck Hill in his 'Footsteps of Dr Johnson in Scotland'; but it is proposed to recall the personalities of some of those whom Johnson met in Edinburgh and to furnish interesting particulars of their careers drawn from local knowledge.

When, on Sunday morning (Aug. 15), Johnson breakfasted at Boswell's house, the first person to whom he was introduced was Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo, a baronet and banker. Boswell characterises him as 'a good companion and a good Christian.' No one who knows will be inclined to impugn the statement. Forbes was a man of liberal ideas, of refinement and taste. And his philanthropy was as conspicuous as his catholicity. The prime mover in almost every local enterprise for the public welfare, he was held in high esteem. An illness which he had was watched with 'the anxious apprehension of a general calamity,' and all Edinburgh rejoiced over his recovery. But before all else Forbes was a far-seeing man of business, as became the leading partner in a private banking concern which was a tower of strength

in more than one financial panic. Pitt not only consulted him, but offered him an Irish peerage, which was declined. Forbes, too, made a respectable figure in literary circles and was the friend and biographer of the poet Beattie. Boswell had great respect for his judgment, and submitted to him the manuscript of the 'Tour,' wherein Forbes discovered 'a high degree of instruction as well as entertainment.' Scott, again, speaks warmly of this Edinburgh banker in the Introduction to the fourth canto of 'Marmion.' Dr Johnson was much attracted to Forbes, and no doubt was gladdened when he learnt that the baronet was among the foremost of Episcopalians in Edinburgh. It was natural, therefore, that on that Sunday morning Forbes should be of the number who accompanied Johnson to Lord Chief Baron Smith's chapel in Blackfriars Wynd. On his return from the Hebrides the Doctor spent an evening at Forbes's house in the New Town. Nor was this their last meeting. In 1776 Forbes supped with Johnson and Boswell at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in London, when all three exercised their minds on the momentous question as to 'whether drinking improved conversation and benevolence.'

At the Episcopal chapel in Blackfriars Wynd, Johnson was presented to Lord Chief Baron Orde, of the Scottish Exchequer, 'a respectable English judge' domiciled in Edinburgh, where he 'built an elegant house and lived in it magnificently.' Baron Orde's residence may still be viewed. Situated in Queen Street, it is reckoned one of the finest examples of the domestic architecture of Robert Adam, a thing of classic beauty, lavishly but tastefully ornamented inside and out, and in size exceeding any other house in the immediate neighbourhood. The Chief Baron was immensely wealthy and he entertained on a great scale, Johnson being of those who shared his hospitality. In short, Orde was, to quote Boswell, 'on good terms with us all, in a narrow country filled with jarring interests and keen parties.' His daughter, Elizabeth, became the second wife of Lord Braxfield, the 'Hangin' Judge' whom R. L. Stevenson has immortalised in 'Weir of Hermiston.' Besides Chief Baron Orde, the Doctor at the Episcopal chapel made the acquaintance of Robert Arbuthnot, a relative of the celebrated John Arbuthnot, physician and wit, as well as the

friend of Pope and Swift. For their 'very agreeable reception at St Andrews' Johnson and Boswell were indebted to young Arbuthnot, 'a man of literature and taste.'

Johnson dined sumptuously that Sunday evening under Boswell's roof. When the repast was over William Robertson, the historian, 'came and drank wine' with the company, his clerical duties at Old Greyfriars Church having prevented his arriving earlier. Johnson preferred Goldsmith as a historian to Robertson, one reason being the latter's proneness to rhetorical flourishes. 'I would say to Robertson what an old tutor of a college said to one of his pupils: "Read over your compositions, and wherever you meet with a passage which you think is particularly fine, strike it out."' But whatever Johnson might say, Robertson at any rate made the writing of history a huge commercial success. His 'History of Charles V' brought him 4500*l*. (the highest price paid for a work of this nature up to that time), with superlative praise from Gibbon and Voltaire. Though frequently communing with the unorthodox, Robertson was an ardent Presbyterian. In the General Assembly he is said to have acquired greater influence than any other ecclesiastic since Melville, and for many years he led the Moderate party with great ability. In addition to being joint minister with Dr John Erskine, a stout Evangelical, of Old Greyfriars, he was a royal chaplain, and from 1762 Principal of Edinburgh University, where, perhaps, his most enduring work was done. Yet Robertson cannot be acclaimed a man of original powers. He lacked intellectual depth and was serenely complacent. He liked to talk, but there was a superficiality about what he said which almost justified Dr Alexander Carlyle's remark that Robertson skimmed the conversation of his friends and then gave it back to them in polished phrases.

Temperamentally far apart, Johnson and Robertson yet drew to each other, and the talk that Sunday evening seems to have flowed on smoothly enough, centring first on Burke and then veering round to Whitefield and Wesley, both of whom were familiar figures in Edinburgh, to which they came often in fulfilment of their apostolic labours. The next morning Robertson was back at Boswell's house, and after breakfasting with the great man and discussing Ogden on prayer, undertook to show

Johnson the principal objects of interest in the city. Robertson naturally was at his best when conducting him over the College, though he deemed it incumbent to apologise for the meanness of the buildings which, he told the illustrious visitor, might be mistaken for almshouses. But before Johnson had been many years in his grave the old, unsightly buildings were swept away and gradually there was reared in their place the present stately edifice.

After a day of sightseeing Johnson returned to James's Court, where a company met him at dinner. In addition to Robertson, Sir William Forbes, and the old Duchess of Douglas, there was present William Cullen, the most famous Scots physician of the time. It was Cullen who was consulted by Boswell in regard to Johnson's last illness. Cullen talked 'in a very entertaining manner' of people walking and conversing in their sleep—so entertainingly that Boswell laments having no note of the conversation. How Johnson regarded the exposition we cannot tell, but on another occasion he let it be known that Cullen's views on sleep were not altogether to his liking. 'Surely, Cullen,' he jocularly remarked, 'would not have a man to get up after having slept but an hour. Such a regimen would soon end in a *long sleep*.' Cullen's son Robert was also of the company. He was styled the 'courteous Cullen' because of his elegant manners, and Dugald Stewart says that he was 'the most perfect of all mimics.' According to Cockburn, the younger Cullen was 'too indolent and irregular to attain steady practice' at the Scottish Bar, but the fact remains that he became a Lord of Session. But what commended him to Johnson were his brilliancy and an interest in literature which found an outlet in contributions to the 'Mirror' and the 'Lounger.'

A much stronger dialectician appeared at the supper-table in the person of Andrew Crosbie, the original of Counsellor Pleydell in 'Guy Mannering.' Unlike Cullen, Crosbie had a lucrative practice as an advocate and was able to build himself a very imposing residence in St Andrew Square. But, to use Andrew Lang's phrase, he was an 'advocate of great talents who frolicked to ruin.' This 'truly learned and philosophical friend' of Boswell was the patron of 'High Jinks' and the 'Assassin' of

the Poker Club. In the end his expensive and convivial habits brought about a crash. Still Lord Stowell recollected that Crosbie was the only man among the literati of Edinburgh who could hold his own with the autocrat of English letters in the eighteenth century. Certainly Johnson found Crosbie a redoubtable opponent on the subject of witches, though he formed a high opinion of his conversational powers generally.

Forbes came to breakfast on Tuesday morning (Aug. 17) and brought with him Dr Thomas Blacklock, the blind poet, whom Johnson came to reverence. A negligible versifier but most amiable man, it was his proud distinction to have succoured, intellectually and morally, the two greatest literary Scotsmen at the threshold of their careers. Blacklock was the first to write appreciatively of Burns, the first to set Scott in the path of literary endeavour. Educated for the ministry of the Church of Scotland, the poet held a border parish for a brief period, but his blindness was a formidable drawback and he resigned. Blacklock then settled in Edinburgh, where he earned a precarious livelihood by tutoring young men attending the university. Most of his leisure was spent in composing verse which did credit to his industry rather than to his imagination. Johnson and Blacklock became friends at once. The Doctor, we are told, received the blind poet with 'a most humane complacency'—'Dear Dr Blacklock, I am glad to see you!' On the same day as he talked with Blacklock at Boswell's house, Johnson wrote agreeable impressions of him to Mrs Thrale: 'This morning I saw at breakfast Dr Blacklock, the blind poet, who does not remember to have seen light, and is read to by a poor scholar in Latin, Greek, and French. He was originally a poor scholar himself. I looked on him with reverence.' Boswell declares that Blacklock 'seemed to be much surprised when Johnson said it was easier to him to write poetry than to compose his Dictionary.' When the 'Tour' appeared, however, Blacklock wrote to the author, and explained that the real cause of his surprise was that Johnson could 'write a sheet of dictionary with as much pleasure as a sheet of poetry.'

Towards the end of his stay in Scotland Johnson breakfasted with Blacklock, who then resided in Crichton Street. Henry Mackenzie, the 'Man of Feeling,' who

was also a guest, remarks that Johnson did not create a favourable impression. For one thing, Mrs Blacklock considered it rather odd that the lexicographer should drink twenty-two cups of tea. But let us hope Johnson atoned for this indiscretion by holding Blacklock's 'remarkably small white hands in his great paws during the most part of the time they conversed together, caressing and stroking them as he might have done those of a pretty child.'

How Johnson spent the afternoon of that Tuesday Boswell does not record, but in the evening the dinner party invited to meet him included three eminent physicians—Sir Alexander Dick, of Prestonfield, Dr James Gregory, the compounder of 'Gregory's Mixture,' and Dr John Boswell, the uncle of Johnson's host. Cockburn describes Gregory as 'a curious and excellent man, a great physician, a great lecturer, a great Latin scholar, and a great talker, vigorous and generous, large of stature, and with a strikingly powerful countenance.' But Gregory was combative; he dissipated his energies in fruitless controversy. None the less he should have appealed to Johnson, though we are not told that he did so. Dr Boswell was probably more deferential to Johnson than Gregory. At any rate, he regarded him as 'a robust genius, born to grapple with whole libraries' and, holding this view, we may be sure that he took delight in showing the English visitor his 'curious museum' when the latter spent a forenoon at his house on the Castle Hill. Johnson, on the other hand, found Dr Boswell good company. But professional attainments apart, the most attractive of this medical trio was Sir Alexander Dick, the laird of Prestonfield.

The other members of the company were Sir David Dalrymple, a Senator of the College of Justice with the title of Lord Hailes, and John Maclaurin, a son of the celebrated mathematician, whose 'learning and talents' enabled him 'to do his part very well in Dr Johnson's company.' Boswell reports this to have been 'one of Dr Johnson's best days,' for 'all was literature and taste without any interruption.' Hailes, with his finished scholarship and critical power, 'pleased him highly,' despite his taking exception to a passage in the 'Vanity of Human Wishes.'

At supper Johnson found Dr Alexander Webster 'a very agreeable companion,' as well he might, for this Presbyterian minister, like himself, was of marked individuality, prolific in original and beneficent ideas, and of such versatility that he could have adorned several professions. Had he lived in our time, Webster would have been at the head of a life-insurance company. He was the earliest expert in rates of mortality. Indeed, his influence in this branch of knowledge is still operative, for the tables of average longevity drawn up by him in connection with the Ministers' Widows Fund of the Church of Scotland, of which he was the founder, are so reliable that they still form the basis for similar calculations made by life-assurance companies.

Nor did Webster's actuarial success militate against his career as a minister of the Church of Scotland, for he held several royal appointments, including that of Dean of the Chapel Royal. His strong Hanoverian proclivities accounted no doubt for his privileged position. And we may be certain that his partiality for the reigning dynasty would not be lost on Johnson, who was deeply impressed, too, with his 'fund of information and entertainment.' After returning to London, Johnson admonished Boswell to 'quicken Dr Webster,' the latter having promised to supply him with information concerning the Highlands. But when it arrived Johnson was disappointed, the particulars being 'much less exact and much less determinate' than he expected. While in Edinburgh Johnson found time to visit Webster at his house on the Castle Hill, where he seems to have talked on rather obscure topics. It was to Webster that he confided the view that hardly any man died without affectation, a remark, says Boswell, which accounts for many of the celebrated death-bed sayings that are recorded.

Johnson spent but three days in Edinburgh before setting out with Boswell for the Hebrides. Yet the time was sufficiently long to convince him of the fact that Scotland was not the backward, insular, uncouth country he had imagined; that, on the contrary, there dwelt, at least in its capital, men of light and leading with whom he found it an education as well as a pleasure to converse—men who in respect of intellectual outlook and all the attributes of a high standard of culture were hardly

behind those who forgathered at the Literary Club in Fleet Street. It is not too much to say that these memorable days, passed amid the best society that Edinburgh could produce, modified to an appreciable extent Johnson's distorted view of Boswell's countrymen. When in a querulous mood he might still be facetious over their speech, their behaviour, their manners and customs, but never again was he to be taken seriously when uttering a deprecatory judgment of Scotsmen.

After an absence of eighty-three days in the Western Islands (to use the term employed in the title of his 'Journey'), Johnson found himself once more in Edinburgh. On this occasion he spent nearly a fortnight in the city, during which he was fully confirmed in his former impressions. He met again most of his old friends and many new ones, he was lavishly entertained at various houses in and around Edinburgh, and he was taken to see many objects which afforded him instruction as well as delight. This elaborate programme, arranged and punctiliously carried through by Boswell, was not, at first, in accordance with the wishes of Johnson, who explains his position in a letter to Mrs Thrale. 'I long to come under your care,' he writes, 'but for some days cannot decently get away.' As we have seen, his residence in the Scottish capital on this occasion was prolonged for almost two weeks. Nor did Johnson really desire that it could have been otherwise, for altogether it was a joyous time for him, likewise a period so full of enrichment that Johnson would not in the end have wittingly lost a minute of it. 'Sir,' he said one evening, 'we have been harassed by invitations.' Boswell acquiesced, and then came the rejoinder: 'Ay, sir, but how much worse would it have been if we had been neglected!' In short, those hectic days in Edinburgh constituted a fitting culmination of what perhaps was the most unforgettable event in his whole life.

Johnson's return visit to Edinburgh was for him the 'crowded hour of glorious life,' for his time was consumed in fulfilling one pleasurable engagement after another. And when not seeing people he was busy visiting places of interest. On the morning after his arrival there came to breakfast at Boswell's house 'old Mr Drummond, the bookseller,' whom Johnson had not seen for ten years.

'A gentleman of good family but small estate,' Drummond was one of the ardent Jacobites who had taken up arms in 1745. After the rising he lived in concealment in London. It was then that he became acquainted with Johnson, who held him in much esteem. Drummond induced Johnson to take up the cudgels against those who objected on political grounds to a scheme for issuing a Gaelic Bible. In 1767 the lexicographer wrote several indignant letters on the subject, which were addressed to Drummond. Similarly, the bookseller did Johnson a good turn by engaging in 'an office of charity.' The relationship was further cemented by Johnson visiting Drummond at his home in Edinburgh. It was there, one recalls, that the Doctor controverted Sir John Dalrymple's assertion that the two noblest animals in the world were 'a Scotch Highlander and an English sailor.' 'Why, sir (replied Johnson), I shall say nothing as to the Scotch Highlander; but as to the English sailor, I cannot agree with you.' And if the pictures of seafaring life in the eighteenth century which Smollett has drawn in 'Roderick Random' are to be regarded as trustworthy, Johnson was right.

Another who sat at Boswell's breakfast-table that morning was Patrick, Lord Elibank. His lordship greatly admired Johnson, but being aware of his prejudices never expected to see him in Scotland. It was Elibank who made the oft-quoted reply to the Doctor's definition of oats—a reply which, as Dr Birkbeck Hill remarks, has every merit but a foundation of fact. 'Oats,' wrote Johnson in his 'Dictionary,' 'a grain which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people.' 'Very true,' answered his lordship, 'and where will you find such men and such horses?'

Elibank was of the same school of politics as 'old Mr Drummond'—'a very prating, impertinent Jacobite,' Horace Walpole dubs him, not without a spice of malice. His lordship was certainly a member of the notorious Cocoa Tree Club, which, Boswell testifies, was 'sacred of old to loyalty.' It is known, too, that he had a secret correspondence with Prince Charles Edward after the 'Forty-five. Still Johnson had 'a very high opinion' of Elibank, and was never in his company without learning something. On the other hand, Elibank was prepared 'to go five hundred miles to enjoy a day' with Johnson.

The Doctor and Boswell dined thrice and slept two nights at Ballencrieff, Elibank's seat in East Lothian. The mansion was burnt some sixty years ago, but the outer walls still stand by the roadside not far from another melancholy ruin—that of Redhouse. But long before the fire Ballencrieff had been deserted by its owners in favour of Darnhall (or Blackbarony) in Peeblesshire, and to-day the Elibank family own no land in East Lothian. Johnson seems to have enjoyed himself at Ballencrieff, though the performances of a French cook so much displeased him that, somewhat rudely, he exclaimed: 'I'd throw such a rascal into the river,' by which he probably meant the Firth of Forth, for there is no river near Ballencrieff.

'Mr. Nairne,' who accompanied Johnson and Boswell into Fife at the outset of their journey to the Hebrides, also was of the breakfast party. This boon companion of Boswell's youth became Sir William Nairne, Bart, and in 1786 ascended the Bench as Lord Dunsinnan. His parsimony was proverbial. There was, it is said, only one bed at Dunsinnan, so as to preclude hospitality to strangers. Still, Boswell succeeded in ingratiating Nairne with Johnson, who visited this lawyer's house in the Back Stairs. It was there that the Doctor drew the character of Richardson, the author of 'Clarissa Harlowe,' with 'a strong yet delicate pencil.' At dinner that evening (Nov. 10) Johnson discoursed on the authenticity of 'Fingal' and second sight to a select and brilliant company. First of all, there was the Dowager Lady Colville, whom Boswell was proud to introduce as the living embodiment of the 'dignity and grace' that are to be found in Scotland. The widow of the sixth Lord Colville of Culross, Vice Admiral of the White, she resided, in her later years, at Drumsheugh, then a thickly wooded estate on the western outskirts of Edinburgh but now covered with houses. Johnson and Boswell visited Lady Colville at Drumsheugh, where the Doctor confuted the statement of a military man, who declared that Lord Mansfield was not a great English lawyer.

At Boswell's dinner-table also sat Lady Colville's sister, Lady Anne Erskine, who was as vivacious as herself, and the Honourable Andrew Erskine, whom we recognise as the person who collaborated with Boswell in penning a series of bombastic letters, which the writers

had the temerity to publish. Erskine also had a hankering after poetical renown, being a contributor, like Boswell, to Donaldson's 'Collection of Original Poems by Scottish Gentlemen.' He was a brother of Thomas Alexander Erskine, sixth Earl of Kelly, perhaps the greatest non-professional musician in eighteenth-century Scotland. Besides the three members of the talented Erskine family there present was Dr Hugh Blair, minister of the High Church. He was not only the most fashionable preacher of the day, but the first occupant of the Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in Edinburgh University—an unusual distinction. In his lectures Blair had deprecated Johnson's pompous style, but was careful to omit the passage before sending the manuscript to the printers. Yet he was himself by no means free from pomposity, and had Johnson most to thank for bringing about the publication of his sermons—those sermons which, despite the cold morality they expounded, yielded him a small fortune. Johnson, at any rate, had no doubt as to Blair's powers as a preacher. 'I love Blair's "Sermons."' Though the dog is a Scotchman and a Presbyterian, and everything he should not be, I was the first to praise them.' But this is to glance into futurity, for when Blair—a sedate but vain man—met Johnson at Boswell's house in James's Court, his reputation for pulpit eloquence was still in the making.

Johnson also was confronted with William Tytler of Woodhouselee, a man who carried more ballast than Blair and was fully his equal as regards good taste and literary ability. This member of the accomplished Tytler family mainly lives for us by his exculpatory 'Inquiry into the Evidence against Mary Queen of Scots,' which ran through four editions and was most charitably reviewed by Johnson in the 'Gentleman's Magazine.' And Tytler, be it noted, was as generous in his comments on Johnson's 'Journey.' He detected a 'few errors,' but these were 'lost in the numberless beauties of the work.'

The literary tradition in the Woodhouselee family was maintained by Tytler's son, Alexander, who, though a lawyer by profession and afterwards a Scots Judge with the title of Lord Woodhouselee, was devoted to letters. 'Young Mr Tytler' it was who delayed Johnson's departure for London, having come to show him some essays he had written. Alexander Tytler's first literary flights

were made in the pages of the 'Mirror' and 'Lounger,' but his masterpiece is the 'Life of Lord Kames,' first published in 1807. Boswell himself intended to write the biography of this formidable Scots jurisconsult and actually received some material from Kames. But, like so many more projects of Boswell, it was never carried out. Lord Woodhouselee, however, in the second edition of his 'Life of Lord Kames,' utilised passages from Boswell's manuscript. These consist of anecdotes relating to the earlier portion of Kames's career.

At supper Johnson had some conversation with Dr John Erskine and Robert Walker, 'two very respectable ministers of Edinburgh'; also with Dr Webster, to whom reference has been made. When, in 'Guy Mannering,' Scott brings the English stranger to Old Greyfriars Church, it is to Erskine's preaching that he listens, not to that of his more distinguished colleague, Principal Robertson. The latter was the hierophant of Moderatism, but Erskine was an uncompromising Evangelical, the warm friend of Whitefield and Wesley. Of this circumstance Johnson may have been aware. Be that as it may, part of the conversation that evening related to Methodists, a subject on which Erskine and Walker (the latter the colleague of Hugh Blair and, like Erskine, an Evangelical) might be expected to hold their own. Johnson admitted that the Methodists had done good among the 'vulgar part of mankind' but lamented their 'great bitterness against other Christians.' Johnson's levee on Nov. 11 was attended by Robertson, Lord Elibank, and Sir William Forbes, all of whom engaged once more in lively talk with the Doctor, who enlarged upon the methods of writing history—a delicate topic to mention in Robertson's presence. Voltaire being cited, Robertson pointed out that the great Frenchman lived much with the great people of his time, 'and then either took Mr Boswell's way, of writing down what he heard, or, which is as good, preserved it in his memory.'

As has been indicated, Boswell kept no journal of the closing days of Johnson's visit to Edinburgh but relied on his memory, which, happily, seldom played him false. Indeed, what is served up in the concluding pages of the 'Journal' is almost as circumstantial as, and not one whit less readable than, the results of his notetaking. During

this period Johnson, we are told, 'dined at Lady Colville's, Lord Hailes's, Principal Robertson's, Mr Maclaurin's, and thrice at Lord Elibank's seat in the country (Ballencrieff).' All the members of this group have been already referred to—except Sir James Adolphus Oughton, who, as his name implies, was not a Scotsman, but was temporarily located north of the Tweed in the capacity of Commander of the Forces in Scotland. Johnson characterises Oughton as 'a very extraordinary man; a man of boundless curiosity and unusual intelligence.' For Boswell, again, this distinguished soldier was 'one of the most universal scholars' he had ever known. During his stay in Scotland Oughton resided at Caroline Park House, a seventeenth-century mansion with interesting architectural features situated on the shores of the Firth of Forth near Granton. Here he entertained Dr Johnson on at least one occasion.

It will have been noticed that Johnson's intellectual bouts while in Edinburgh were not restricted to any particular time or place. With him it was not a case of post-prandial philosophy. An exhibition of his skill in dialectics was expected at every meal, for he never partook of a repast at which guests invited to meet him were not present. During the latter portion of his stay in the city he went abroad on several occasions to dine or sup with Boswell's friends. One day he sallied forth to a house on the Castle Hill, there to breakfast with 'the Honourable Alexander Gordon, now one of our judges, by the title of Lord Rockville.' With Boswell, Gordon was a special favourite. A son of the second Earl of Aberdeen, he was handsome besides being well-born. 'Douglas's Peerage' alludes to the 'dignified manliness of his appearance' and the 'polished urbanity of his manners.' He married the widow of William, Earl of Dumfries and Stair, and was altogether a fine specimen of the Scottish aristocracy. It was Gordon who, when Johnson recalled Lord Lovat's boast that he could at any time place two thousand men in the field, remarked that Lovat's armed force brought him to the block. 'True, sir,' replied Johnson, 'but you may just as well argue concerning a man who has fallen over a precipice to which he has walked too near—"His two legs brought him to it." Is he not the better for having two legs?'

Johnson also paid visits to Nairne, Blair, Webster, Tytler, Blacklock, and several others. Some of these visits followed invitations to breakfast, so that we may suppose the Doctor to have become habituated to early rising when in Edinburgh. On the other hand, breakfasting at Boswell's house was something of an ordeal, the meal usually being prolonged into the afternoon. On such occasions he had, Boswell records, 'from ten o'clock till one or two a constant levee of various persons, of very different characters and descriptions.' Furthermore, matters were complicated by the fact that Boswell 'could not attend him, being obliged to be in the Court of Session.' His wife, however, 'was so good as to devote the greater part of the morning to the endless task of pouring out tea' for Johnson and those who came to see him.

When, on Nov. 22, Johnson's memorable stay in Edinburgh came to an end there was no regret that he had not acted on his original resolution and—the Hebridean tour being finished—returned post-haste to London. He had seen and interchanged ideas with the intellectual aristocracy of Scotland, and everywhere he had been received and entertained and appreciated with a cordiality which surprised him. That Johnson's visit to Edinburgh heightened, if it did not wholly transform, his estimate of Scottish character and the amount of culture that could be superimposed thereupon is a well-authenticated fact. And his visit was fruitful in another direction. An epigrammatic sentence of his own affords the best explanation of what is implied: 'When I find a Scotchman to whom an Englishman is as a Scotchman, that Scotchman shall be as an Englishman to me.' Henceforth Johnson acted in the spirit of this resolution. His prejudices were never entirely blotted out, but they perceptibly waned. Having found that Scotsmen treated him well, they became Englishmen to him.

W. FORBES GRAY.

Art. 9.—BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY.

1. *Britain in Europe, 1789 to 1914. A Survey of Foreign Policy.* By R. W. Seton-Watson. Cambridge University Press, 1937.
2. *The Letters of Queen Victoria.* Edited by Viscount Esher, A. C. Benson, and G. E. Buckle. 9 Vols. Murray, 1907-1932.
3. *British Foreign Secretaries, 1807-1916.* By Algernon Cecil. Bell, 1927.
4. *Histoire Diplomatique de L'Europe, 1815-1878.* 2 vols. Par A. Débidour. Félix Alcan, 1891.
5. *British Documents on the Origins of the War.* Edited by G. P. Gooch and Harold Temperley. 11 Vols. His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1926-1937.
6. *England and the International Policy of the European Great Powers, 1871-1914.* By A. F. Pibram. Oxford University Press, 1931.
7. *The States of Europe (1815-1871).* By R. B. Mowat. Arnold, 1932.
8. *Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880.* By B. H. Sumner. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

'It is not our business to collect trophies, but to bring back the world to peaceful habits.' In those words one of the greatest of Foreign Secretaries summarised the aims of British policy at the close of the Napoleonic Wars. Lord Castlereagh spoke for all his successors. Although he commanded the confidence of Continental statesmen in greater measure than any British statesman of the nineteenth century, not even Castlereagh could permanently dispel the suspicion with which British policy is commonly regarded. Political legends die hard. Among these one of the most persistent is that England is hopelessly perfidious, inconstant in friendship, and not to be relied upon to maintain enmities a moment longer than suits her own interests, commercial or political. 'L'Angleterre,' wrote Peter the Great, 'est une puissance déchirée entre elle et variable dans ses projets.' 'De tous les pays qu'elle (l'Europe) renferme, il n'y en a point où les maximes de gouvernement varient plus souvent qu'en Angleterre,' so wrote Torcy in 1715. In 1783, Vergennes, greatest of the French diplomatists of the

eighteenth century, wrote: 'Rien n'était si versatile que la politique du cabinet de Saint-James, ni plus soumis à l'influence momentanée du ministère, dont le changement puisque journalier empêche le conseil de Saint-James d'avoir des principes fixes sur les affaires du Continent.' The judgment of the great Austrian Minister Kaunitz tallied with that of his French contemporary Vergennes. 'Avec un si singulier Gouvernement on ne peut réellement compter sur rien.' Even Albert Sorel, the most brilliant and the most judicial of recent French historians, in citing these judgments does not dissent from them: 'Nulle suite dans les hommes ni dans les affaires, et par conséquent point de politique possible ni d'alliances assurées.' The legend of British inconstancy, the commonplace of Continental diplomacy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was accepted by Bismarck at the end of the nineteenth:

'If England had clear and strong aims, and above all the courage to avow them publicly, she could find any alliances she needed; but if to her parliamentary weaknesses she adds indecision and dishonesty, and a disposition to use her Allies with a certain egotistical card-sharping, then every one is on the watch.'

The indictment of British policy, of British good faith, is a serious one. Can it be sustained? Let it be frankly admitted that from the point of view of a Continental diplomatist, the accusation is not merely specious but substantial. What were French kings and Hapsburg emperors to make of English policy in the sixteenth century—especially when dictated by Queen Elizabeth? Could either Louis XIV or his antagonist, William of Orange, count on the constancy of Charles II? Did not England desert her allies in 1713 in order to conclude an advantageous peace with France? Had not Frederick the Great, our ally in the Seven Years' War, cause to complain of England's 'perfidy' in 1762? Could Metternich and his 'Holy Allies' be expected to appreciate or even to understand the policy of George Canning? Those critics, diplomatists or historians, who concentrate their attention on *detail*, on the day to day, or even year to year, conduct of Great Britain, can easily find justification for their harsh judgments. They find in English

policy nothing comparable to the fixed adherence of France to the tradition she believes herself to have inherited from Charlemagne. 'Le point de départ de ce grand procès qui occupe toute l'histoire de France, c'est l'insoluble litige de la succession de l'Empereur [Charlemagne]. . . . De Philippe Auguste à Napoleon elle [l'image du grand Empereur] plane sur l'histoire de France !' Sorel is right. The tradition remains unbroken, and the policy founded on that tradition has involved the Gauls in ceaseless strife with the Teutons. 'Le but de mon ministère a rendre à la Gaule les frontières que lui a destinées la nature, de rendre aux Gaulois un roi Gaulois, de confondre la Gaule avec la France, et partout où fut l'ancienne Gaule d'y rétablir la nouvelle.' Whether Richelieu's *Testament* was authentic or not matters little : those words represent the constant aim of his own policy—of French policy from Richelieu to Napoleon, from Napoleon to Foch.

Is it possible for the most indulgent of commentators to discover in English policy an adherence to fixed principles comparable to the consistency of France ? On the short view we must frankly confess that it is not. Viewed in just historical perspective, English policy is on the contrary revealed as not less consecutive and consistent than that pursued by France.

Needless to say that England has always been impatient of the formulæ congenial to the Latin mind. Very rarely have her statesmen formulated the principles of the policy to which they have in fact adhered.* We can, therefore, imagine the embarrassment of poor Lord Granville when, after the dismissal of Lord Palmerston in 1851, his young successor was suddenly required by Queen Victoria to submit to her a clear statement of principles as well as a programme of their application. The Queen expressed the hope that 'our foreign policy may be more *specifically defined* and that it may be considered how the general principles are to be practically adopted to our peculiar relations with each continental State' (Dec. 28, 1851). Lord John Russell, through

* Perhaps the most remarkable exception to this rule is to be found in Sir Eyre Crowe's brilliant memorandum of Jan. 1, 1907. Cf. British Documents, vol. III, App. III.

whom, as Prime Minister, the requisition was conveyed, by no means relished the task he was required to impose on his young colleague: 'I have told H.M. that it is not the policy of this Country to make engagements except in view of the circumstances of the moment.' Lord Granville could not, of course, disobey the orders of his imperious Sovereign, but his analysis, of which only a draft survives, contains little else than 'glimpses of the obvious.' We were 'to encourage progress among all other nations.' Our foreign policy was to be 'marked by justice, moderation, and self-respect.' One of the first duties of a British Government was 'to obtain for our foreign trade that security which is essential to commercial success.' We must protect British subjects of all classes engaged in innocent pursuits abroad, but must abstain from intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. Nevertheless, we should 'cultivate the most intimate relations with the countries which have adopted institutions similar in liberality to our own,' and so forth. For superb platitudes and cautious commonplace Lord Granville's memorandum can never have been excelled. What satisfaction Her Majesty derived from the perusal of it is not, unfortunately, recorded. But that she cordially welcomed the substitution of Lord Granville for Lord Palmerston is manifest. 'I have the greatest pleasure in announcing to you a piece of news which I know will give you as much satisfaction and relief as it does to us and will do to the *whole* of the world. Lord Palmerston is no longer Foreign Secretary.' So the Queen wrote to her 'dearest uncle,' the King of the Belgians (Dec. 23, 1851); and there is much more evidence of similar import.

Many years later Mr Gladstone, in the course of his Midlothian campaign, defined the fundamental principles on which British foreign policy should rest with a precision unusual for him and not often attempted by other statesmen in this country. His 'six points' were as follows: (1) 'To foster the strength of the Empire . . . and to reserve it for great and worthy occasions'; (2) 'To preserve to the nations . . . the blessings of peace'; (3) 'To cultivate to the utmost the concert of Europe'; (4) 'To avoid needless and entangling engagements'; (5) 'To acknowledge the rights of all nations' and not

to 'claim for yourself a pharisaical superiority,' and (6) a 'desire to give [love of freedom] scope.' 'This definition of policy,' as Dr Seton-Watson truly says, 'still corresponds with modern requirements.' It does not conflict with the famous utterances of Disraeli and Canning and 'may be said . . . to form quite logically the half-way house between Castlereagh's first efforts at international cooperation and that fuller and more august doctrine of a League of Nations, which is to-day on trial at Geneva' (p. 548).

Mr Gladstone's amiable principles are not, however, for our immediate purpose, sufficient. They neither explain the severe condemnation of England's inconstancy, already quoted, nor do they provide a brief for the confutation of hostile criticism. Can such an explanation be found? Can such a brief be provided? It is the submission of the present article that they can: that even though British policy has, at many particular junctures, caused our enemies, and even more perhaps our friends, to blaspheme, it has, nevertheless, over a long course of years, exhibited an amazingly steadfast adherence to certain fixed maxims of conduct in international affairs. The first is that for the preservation of our independence and for the maintenance of European tranquillity no single Power can be permitted to dominate the continent.

Of English Foreign Ministers Thomas Wolsey was the first and undeniably one of the greatest. What was the pivot of his policy? Lingard, the great Roman Catholic historian, with no bias in Wolsey's favour, shall answer:

'His great object was to preserve the balance of power between the rival houses of France and Austria: and to this we should refer the mutable politics of the English Cabinet (*sic*), which first deserted Francis to support the cause of Charles, and when Charles had obtained the ascendancy, abandoned him to repair the broken fortunes of Francis. The consequence was, that as long as Wolsey presided in the Council, the minister was feared and courted by princes and pontiffs, the King held the distinguished station of arbiter of Europe.'

'Mutable': precisely. That is the gist of the common criticism. Mutable the policy was, on the short view;

but, on the long view, 'mutability' was the essence of consistency. England *la puissance médiatrice* from Wolsey's day onwards was, with rare and brief exceptions, to play a mediatorial part: hers it was to maintain the continental equilibrium.

What would have happened to England and to Europe if Mary Tudor had borne the child she so ardently hoped for, it is impossible to surmise. Or if Queen Elizabeth had accepted the proffered hand of Philip II? But Elizabeth had graduated in the school of Wolsey. England's true policy was 'mediatorial': for a Queen 'married to England' (Elizabeth's own phrase) to marry anyone else would be nothing less than political adultery. To this suitor or to that she might hold out hopes, but to commit herself irrevocably would be fatally to upset the equilibrium. To the captious critic her policy offered a tempting target. 'Mutable?' Was she not a woman consumed by vanity and insatiate in her appetite for admiration? Did she ever really know her own mind? Was she not invariably in two minds? Were her hesitations and procrastinations dictated in fact by profound policy or merely the result of inconstancy of temper and infirmity of will? The philosophical student of politics has another explanation of the Queen's 'mutability.' Needless to say that it accords with the view of British policy through the ages put forward in this paper.

Another factor in the problem emerges clearly in Elizabeth's reign. The influence exercised by the Low Countries upon British policy was destined thenceforth to be permanent. In one sense the factor was not a new one. Flanders, Burgundy, the Spanish Netherlands, the Austrian Netherlands, Holland, Belgium—no matter the political designation—the low lands on the delta of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, have at all times possessed a peculiar interest and significance for England. Before the development of the European states-system that interest was mainly dynastic and economic. From the time of Elizabeth onwards it has been primarily political. Had Philip II not been Lord of the Netherlands there would have been no Spanish Armada. If Louis XIV had not been bent on the chastisement of the insolent merchants of Amsterdam, William of Orange might never have become King of England. Had the French Republic

not meddled with Belgium and Holland Pitt might have kept England—at any rate for some years longer—out of the continental war. If Germany, in August 1914, had marched into France through the gap of Belfort, Great Britain would not have been at war with her on Aug. 4, and might have delayed intervention until it was too late to save France—or herself.

To return. Elizabeth inherited her policy from Henry VII and Wolsey ; but she left no heir. James I was not entirely careless about the continent, but he thought less about political than ecclesiastical equilibrium. Charles I's policy was purely opportunist ; Cromwell, though he made the name of England respected and feared, was primarily concerned to pose as the champion of Protestantism. Bolingbroke's complaint if petulant in tone, has, therefore, substance :

'Cromwell either did not discern this turn of the balance of power [in favour of France] . . . or discerning it, he was induced by reasons of private interest to act against the general interest of Europe. Cromwell joined with France against Spain, and though he got Jamaica and Dunkirk he drove the Spaniards into a necessity of making a peace with France that has disturbed the peace of the world almost four-score years, and the consequences of which have well-nigh beggared in our times the nation he enslaved in his.'

'Jamaica' reminds us that another factor, destined to be not less constant than those already mentioned, had by Cromwell's day entered into the problem of British policy. Britain, no longer the third-rate isle 'half lost among her seas,' became in the seventeenth, and still more obtrusively in the eighteenth century, the centre of an Oceanic Empire. For the establishment and preservation of that Empire irresistible sea-power was an indispensable condition. In the nineteenth century—after the industrial revival had made this country dependent both for daily bread and for the raw material of industry upon supplies from overseas—the Navy became not less essential to insular existence than to Imperial supremacy.

With British policy in the nineteenth century and with the most recent commentary upon it, this article is mainly concerned. Dr Seton-Watson's work is eminently substantial, not to say (physically) unwieldy. Over 700

closely printed pages are packed with the results of prolonged and industrious research. Of the style this at least may be said. Though innocent of ornament or 'frills' of any sort, it carries the reader easily and smoothly through a book which is certainly long and might have been as heavy to read as it is to hold (it weighs 2 lbs. 11 oz.). But for the format of the book the author is not presumably responsible, nor perhaps for the tiresome arrangement by which the notes (more numerous, however, than is in all cases justified by their intrinsic importance) are relegated to the end of the volume. The index, too, though lengthy is not impeccable.

Passing, however, from form to substance, criticism resolves itself, for the most part, into cordial appreciation. All students of the nineteenth century must be unfeignedly grateful to Dr Seton-Watson for giving them in a single volume (though some of them would have preferred two !) from a single pen, a review of the external policy of Great Britain from the days of Napoleon to the outbreak of the World War. The survey is at once extraordinarily comprehensive and noticeably free from bias. Not everyone, of course, can be expected to concur in all the judgments passed by Dr Seton-Watson on events or persons ; but his impartiality and detachment are on the whole remarkable. He has, for instance, shaken himself free of the illusion, common among Englishmen, that British institutions provide a panacea for all political evils in the world. But that being so, it is rather difficult to understand how he can describe Lord William Bentinck's policy in Sicily as 'enlightened,' or can regard it as a 'signpost to the whole Italian movement' (p. 28). If the 'English' Constitution bestowed upon Sicily by Lord William in 1812 was indeed a signpost it should have been, surely, a danger-signal—a warning to Italian Liberals that though imitation may be a sincere form of flattery it is apt to react disastrously upon the imitators. But even if the Sicilians had reason to bless Lord William Bentinck—a highly disputable proposition—the Genoese had reason to curse him: a fact of which Dr Seton-Watson makes no mention, though he follows traditional Liberalism in deploring the transference of Genoa to Piedmont in 1815. How the 'nationalism' of Italy could have been achieved had the 'national feeling' of Genoa been respected is

one of those enigmas which many English champions of the Italian Risorgimento have never satisfactorily solved, or perhaps even resolutely faced. As for Lord William Bentinck, he surely stands confessed as the typical Whig doctrinaire, the insular sentimentalist, highly—and not unjustly—extolled by the great Whig historian for many of the reforms he effected in India, but neglectful of that doctrine of relativity which is the searching test of true statesmanship.

Of the other judgments on individuals passed by Dr Seton-Watson in the course of a long narrative, none seems to be inspired by personal or party bias, most of them are adequate, and not a few are conspicuously good. But there are exceptions. He insists overmuch—three times in half a dozen pages—on the ‘mediocrity’ of Spencer Perceval, who was designated by Pitt as his successor and was a much more considerable personality than the Radical writers of the text-books supplied to schoolboys half a century ago taught us to believe. There is a trace of the old mammon, also, in Dr Seton-Watson’s estimate of Castlereagh. ‘Cold blooded,’ in a sense, Castlereagh was, but his admirers—and they are no longer in a minority—may justly resent Dr Seton-Watson’s disagreeable taunt in reference to Napoleon’s imprisonment in St Helena. ‘With his record in home politics alike in England and Ireland [Castlereagh] was naturally enough indifferent to the odium attaching to a gaoler.’ This jibe is as unworthy as it is untrue. Nor is it quite accurate to say that Castlereagh ‘stands convicted of a conspiracy with Metternich and Ruffo to condone the suppression of Sicilian liberty and to mislead the British Parliament as to the facts’ (p. 50). Castlereagh did not, indeed, tell Parliament all that he wrote privately to Stewart at Vienna and to à Court at Naples, he did insist to Metternich that the word ‘Parliament’ must be retained even if the thing signified thereby disappeared, but Castlereagh can be blamed for duplicity only by those who fail to realise the curious superstition that prevails in England about the universal applicability of Parliamentary Government. On the whole, however, Dr Seton-Watson contrives to do justice—a rare achievement—both to a much maligned and misunderstood statesman and to his more brilliant colleague and rival, George Canning. That being so, it is surprising that Dr

Seton-Watson should have omitted to associate Castlereagh with the bold experiment of uniting Holland and Belgium in a kingdom of the Netherlands, though he does incidentally refer to the union as 'one of the most notable decisions of the allied Powers in 1815.' That the experiment failed was no fault of Castlereagh's; had it succeeded it might conceivably have averted the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1, if not the World War itself. Cordial in his appreciation of Canning, Dr Seton-Watson nevertheless admits that the great orator, in the famous speech in which he defended British neutrality in Spain and deprecated French intervention, employed language which 'must have been most offensive to French ears.' Moderns who seek for political parallels—always a dangerous and elusive quest—ought to study the whole debate of April 14, 1823, and in particular Canning's speech. The Duke of Wellington, speaking, of course, with exceptional knowledge of the Peninsula, had previously expressed the view that 'there is no country in Europe, in the affairs of which foreigners can interfere with so little advantage as Spain.' Canning was of the same opinion; * but he made it clear both to France and to the absolutist Government in Spain that to the non-intervention policy of Great Britain there were limits. 'Great Britain,' he said, 'did not put forward her own political institutions as the model on which those of other States were to be framed or as the only system from which national freedom and happiness could flow,' but 'neither could she allow France to make her own example a rule for other nations.' Canning declined to threaten France with war, since he held—(a view to be commended to irresponsible critics of a Government at all periods)—that 'the country which menaced war ought always to be ready to carry those menaces into execution.' The Government was not prepared to give 'actual and efficient support' to Spain, but though they would be neutral in

* Since this article was in print Professor Temperley has expressed his surprise ('The Times,' Aug. 27) that no one has called attention to the 'striking analogy' between Canning's policy towards Spain in 1823 and the situation to-day. The analogy is, indeed, obvious; but the policy was initiated by Castlereagh and by Canning adopted (as Lord Londonderry pointed out in 'The Times' of Aug. 31) from his predecessor's State Paper of May 5, 1820.

a Franco-Spanish war' he warned France that 'any attack wantonly made on Portugal would bring Britain into the field,' and he warned both the French and Spanish Governments that 'Great Britain would not tolerate for an instant any cession which Spain might make of colonies over which she did not exercise a direct and positive influence.' The sequel proved that this was no empty threat. Before leaving Canning it may be apposite to recall his wise aphorism that England's neutrality should apply not only to 'contending nations' but to 'contending principles.' That is a lesson which zealots, at all times, evidently find it difficult to assimilate.

Canning's mantle fell on the shoulders of Lord Palmerston, whose influence upon British policy was exercised almost continuously from his appointment to the Foreign Office by Lord Grey (1830) until his own death in 1865. To Lord Palmerston Dr Seton-Watson does ample justice. He admits that he was perhaps 'too prone to regard British institutions as a panacea for all political evils in the world,' and he quotes, apparently with approval, the explanation of 'the wise Stockmar' who ascribed Palmerston's idiosyncrasy to an 'insufficient knowledge of continental Europe.' 'I cannot conceive of liberty without two Houses of Parliament and a free Press.' So Palmerston had said in 1849. If the creed thus summarised was simple, the sentiment was entirely genuine. Moreover, it goes a long way towards explaining Palmerston's attitude to continental politics, and some way, perhaps, towards explaining the attitude of continental politicians towards Lord Palmerston. Metternich loved Palmerston as little as Palmerston loved Metternich, who as far back as 1833 had come to the conclusion that Palmerston's character was compounded of 'presumption and naiveté, audacity and gêne.' But even Metternich was less outspoken than his great successor Prince Schwarzenberg. The latter's outburst was indeed provoked, if not justified, by the formal protest addressed by Palmerston to Vienna—against 'a proceeding [the reference was to Radetsky's methods in Lombardy] conceived in the spirit of the most odious oppression and enunciated by doctrines which belong only to the disciples of communism and which are subversive of the very foundations of social order.' Language so censorious was naturally and

deeply resented by Schwarzenberg. 'Lord Palmerston,' he declared in a Circular Note (Dec. 4, 1848),

'regards himself too much as the arbiter of Europe. For our part we are not disposed to accord him the rôle of Providence. We shall never impose our advice on him in regard to Ireland; let him spare himself the trouble of advising us on the subject of Lombardy. . . . We are tired of his eternal insinuations, of his tone now protective and pedantic, now insulting, but always unbecoming. We are resolved to tolerate it no longer.'

A month later the Prince wrote to King Leopold, 'The present condition of Italy is largely the work of English diplomacy. . . . A kingdom of Italy under his [Palmerston's] protection was to be formed by revolution at home and treachery abroad . . . in order to form a counterweight to France in the south.' This was, as Dr Seton-Watson justly remarks, 'a grotesque exaggeration,' but it was little wonder that Queen Victoria was seriously alarmed by Palmerston's language which, as she protested to the Prime Minister, was 'always as bitter as gall.' Her demand for his dismissal was presently successful; but Palmerston soon had his 'tit for tat' on the colleague who dismissed him, and came back; not as Foreign Secretary, but as Prime Minister. Nor did he ever lose his hold on the English people. There was about him something so endearingly and typically English that his faults were condoned if not actually applauded. His patriotism was, indeed, unquestionable, and even the Queen acknowledged that he had many valuable qualities though, as she added: 'I *never* liked him, nor could I forget his conduct on certain occasions to my angel. . . . Still, he is a loss.'

About the influence of the Crown upon foreign policy Dr Seton-Watson has naturally a good deal to say, and, on the whole, his estimate of its extent and character is just. It is not, indeed, clear why he should describe as 'meddling' (p. 47) the interest displayed by the Prince Regent in foreign affairs, but he refers with evident approval to the 'sane middle position' taken up by the Prince Consort in regard to the attitude which England ought to assume toward the internal affairs of her neighbours. The Prince was 'strongly of opinion that England should declare betimes that it *will not endure* that independent States should be forcibly prevented from setting about

such internal reforms as they shall think for their advantage.' On the other hand, he realised that the British Government was 'frequently inclined to plunge States into constitutional reforms towards which they have no inclination,' and this he held to be 'quite wrong, *though it is Lord Palmerston's hobby.*' 'Let England,' he added, 'be careful (in her zeal for progress) not to push any nation beyond its own march, and not to impose upon any nation what that nation does not itself produce.' The language is clumsy, but the sentiment is unexceptionable.

Dr Seton-Watson evidently shares the common opinion that the influence of the Crown upon policy, though never negligible, steadily declined after the death of the Prince Consort. But is that quite certain? During the period, far too prolonged, of the Queen's seclusion in the first decade of her widowhood, that might have been the case. But even then her vigilant supervision was never relaxed and her intervention was not infrequently direct and decisive. In April 1867, for instance, she urged Lord Derby not to acquiesce in the Emperor Napoleon's '*politique de brigand*' in reference to Luxembourg and Belgium; and insisted that England must fulfil her obligations to Belgium ('*even single-handed if need be*'), and she wrote personally to King William of Prussia to urge upon him a policy for the avoidance of war with France. The Empress Eugénie expressed her conviction that the Queen's letter had saved the situation, and Dr Seton-Watson remarks that the whole incident revealed 'Queen Victoria at her very best, placing her already remarkable knowledge of continental politics at the disposal of her ministers, and laying her finger upon certain points which a future age was to recognise as of fundamental importance.' Equally direct and not less successful was the Queen's intervention when, in 1875, Bismarck was suspected of a wish to renew the war with France, in the hope of '*bleeding that country white.*' The Tsar Alexander joined in the Queen's appeal to the Emperor William, and the war project was dropped.

Meanwhile the Queen had found in Disraeli an adviser more congenial than any of her Ministers since the resignation of Lord Aberdeen. Disraeli's policy in the Near East was the subject of a scholarly monograph, '*Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question,*' published

by Dr Seton-Watson only two years ago. It has, even more recently, been re-examined from a different angle in great detail and with shrewdness and impartiality, by another Oxford scholar.* Dr Seton-Watson evidently regrets the refusal of the Disraeli Government to assent to the Berlin memorandum of May 1876, and notes the 'wise warning' of Queen Victoria that her minister's refusal would encourage the Turks and 'thus precipitate rather than prevent the catastrophe.' Mr Sumner, however, admits that the memorandum was 'still-born,' except for the 'tail,' and quotes Bismarck's contemptuous comment, 'Pompon, pompo, pomp, po.' In regard to the final outcome of the whole Near Eastern question (1875-1878) the two scholars are generally agreed. Dr Seton-Watson's opinion that 'to this day there is no justification for the retention of Cyprus, unless to keep the Italians out' will not command universal assent; but his admission that the Treaty of 'Berlin corrected the worst flaws in San Stefano' will be accepted as a welcome symptom of a change of mind on the part of the more acrimonious critics of Disraeli's policy. Every impartial and informed commentator must now surely agree that even if he was deficient in knowledge of the French language and of Near Eastern geography, Disraeli's achievement at Berlin was remarkable. The respite secured for the Turks was, indeed, only temporary, but both Greece and Serbia have reason to be grateful to the man who cut down the Greater Bulgaria defined by the Treaty of San Stefano. And there was another matter of even larger significance. 'Next to making a tolerable settlement for the Porte, our great object was to break up and permanently prevent the alliance of the three empires, and I maintain that there never was a diplomatic result more completely effected.' So said Lord Beaconsfield in 1880. Both Mr Sumner and Dr Seton-Watson (pp. 560 and 549 respectively) repudiate the claim. But it was justified. It is, of course, true that Bismarck did renew the *Dreikaiserbund*—temporarily, and that even after the conclusion of the Triple Alliance he 'reinsured' himself with Russia. Nevertheless, Disraeli was essentially

* 'Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880.' By B. H. Sumner. Oxford, 1937.

accurate. Bismarck had been compelled at Berlin to choose between Vienna and Petersburg, and gallantly as he struggled to maintain the alliance with Austria without sacrificing friendship with Russia, he could not do it. Lord Beaconsfield was justified by events. The Franco-Russian rapprochement—Bismarck's bogey—was implicit in the Treaty of Berlin.

After Disraeli, Gladstone. Queen Victoria's widening alienation from Mr Gladstone after 1880 has been the subject of several recent monographs, and is too notorious to demand further elucidation in this article. The Queen's indignation against the minister reached its acme in connection with the Gordon tragedy at Khartoum. Neither by the Queen nor by the English people was Mr Gladstone's fatal procrastination in that matter ever forgiven. In the last years of the reign, however, the Queen derived great comfort from the steadfastness, caution, and common-sense of a minister after her own heart. Lord Salisbury's adherence to a policy of 'splendid isolation' was, in Dr Seton-Watson's opinion, less obstinate than is commonly assumed; it was rather 'an uncomfortable necessity imposed by the fluid state of continental politics.' But, be that as it may, there can be no doubt as to the significance of the change wrought by Lord Lansdowne.

How far the revolution in English policy was due to a change of Sovereigns as well as a change of Ministers is a question which has been hotly debated. The Earl of Balfour emphatically repudiated as 'a foolish piece of gossip' the idea that King Edward VII 'ever made an important suggestion of any sort on large questions of policy.' But Balfour consistently underrated the intelligence of a king to whom he was temperamentally antipathetic. Lord Lansdowne, on the other hand, specifically referred to the 'powerful impulse' given to the movement towards an Anglo-French Entente by King Edward, and President Poincaré used, with Gallic precision, an identical phrase, '*l'heureuse impulsion donnée . . . par sa majesté*,' in the same direction. As far back as the 'seventies the then Prince of Wales had whispered in a friendly ear that he meant when he came to the throne to be his own Foreign Minister. That ambition he did not achieve; but his interest in foreign affairs was never

relaxed and his influence upon their course was not less real because it was exercised without technical responsibility.

To King Edward's successor it was left not merely to witness but to embody a change in the position of the Monarchy of immeasurable significance. In his tribute in the House of Commons to the memory of King Edward, Mr Balfour had insisted that 'the importance of the Crown in our Constitution is not a diminishing but an increasing factor. It increases and must increase with the development of those free-governing communities beyond the seas, who are constitutionally linked to us through the person of the Sovereign, the living symbol of Imperial Unity.' The language used by Balfour in 1910 anticipates the famous passage which the same statesman penned in the Report of the Imperial Conference of 1926: 'Great Britain and the Dominions are . . . united by common allegiance to the Crown.' The language is almost precisely reproduced in the Preamble to the Statute of Westminster: 'inasmuch as the Crown is the symbol of the free association of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. . . .' On that Statute the Act of Abdication (1936) was specifically based.

Even in the heyday of the Manchester School, Disraeli had foreseen the imminent change in the relation of England to Europe and the extra-European world.

'The day is coming,' he said in 1859, 'if it has not already come, when the question of the balance of power cannot be confined to Europe alone. . . . England . . . is not a mere Power of the Old World. Her geographical position, her laws, her language and religion connect her as much with the New World as with the Old. . . . If ever Europe . . . falls into an inferior and exhausted state, for England there will remain an illustrious future.'

Disraeli's words remain true. In the affairs of Europe it is indeed impossible for England to disinterest herself. But though *in* Europe, she is not *of* Europe. Her foreign policy must needs, therefore, be dictated by consideration for the interests not merely of the insular State, but of the world-Empire over which her Sovereign reigns. But not, on that account, less true, nay more insistently true, are the words used by Canning in 1823: 'Our ultimate object must be the peace of the world.'

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

Art. 10.—THE BRITISH FISHERIES.

AT a time when the fisheries of Great Britain are undergoing complete reorganisation with a view to restoring, if possible, some measure of the stability and prosperity that obtained in pre-War years, more than usual interest attaches to the many intricate problems connected with them that await solution.

When fishermen in former years went to sea in small, deckless boats, simplicity was the key-note of their fishing and marketing activities. The seafarers of early times were accustomed to the frailty of their small-sized craft, which dared not venture far from their home ports and even then were threatened with disaster when overtaken by sudden violent storms. But the growth of the herring markets on the Continent gradually extended the scope of the fisheries, and when decked boats became the order of the day fishermen found at least some degree of comfort in being housed afloat and were able to extend their sea journeys while searching for the silvery herring. Just over half a century ago English fishermen went to sea in sailing craft, and in order to accelerate the start for the fishing grounds boats had to be towed out of Yarmouth harbour with the aid of a tug. No difficulty was experienced in disposing of the quantities of herring taken ashore, and since marketing was sound and progressive the demand for herring was usually keen. There was a steady and a growing output since there existed a ready market, and in one particular year before the War as many as two and a half million barrels of cured herring were sold. Russia then was an even more important buyer than Germany.

With the introduction of the steam drifter the sailing fleet began to decrease in number and English syndicates, becoming aware of the outstanding efficiency and enormous catching power of steam-driven craft, brought about an extensive development in their construction. At least a thousand boats fished from Yarmouth during the years immediately preceding the War, and on occasion the whole breadth of the river was necessary to accommodate the herring fleet. Steam drifters made great headway, landing heavy catches during the herring seasons, particularly at East Anglia, and most syndicates

as well as individual owners were, more often than not, amply recompensed for their enterprise, while wage-earning fishermen were assured of a regular income. At the outbreak of the War the drifter fleet was in first-class order. Many new craft had been built in the years immediately preceding it and quite a number of vessels of a similar type, slightly larger in size, were constructed during the war years. The part played by the drifter fleet in defence and other activities both at home and abroad, according to all accounts, was efficiently performed, and it was realised in no uncertain manner how serviceable drifters could be in time of war as well as in peace-time.

After the recommencement of fishing activities it was not long before syndicates as well as fishermen-owners realised that they would have to contend with a harder struggle than they ever imagined would be in store for them. Economic conditions had completely altered. Depressed herring markets, currency changes and intricacies, drastic political upheavals on the Continent—these and other causes contributed to the non-success of many herring seasons. In time successive financial reverses began to tell their own tale, although companies, fishermen, and fish-curers heroically attempted to make the best of the misfortunes that seemed to be showered upon them. Owing to international difficulties fewer herring could be marketed and the catching side suffered in consequence. All too meagre incomes were swallowed up by the drifters' heavy working expenditure in coal, nets, and other fishing gear. The formation of the Herring Industry Board was both essential and timely. Superabundant supplies of herring were frequently experienced in view of the marketing limitations, and Area Committees were appointed with a view to regulating supplies and with power to close ports temporarily to fishing when exceptionally heavy catches were brought ashore and a large proportion of them could not be sold.

The restoration of the foreign markets has engaged the attention of the Herring Industry Board, and although not much progress had yet been made, the outlook has improved. English drifters during the Scottish and East Anglian seasons last year fared better than they had done for a long time past, as there was a keen demand for

herring in Germany and prices were consistently good. On account of the high price-level, however, curers did not fare so well as they might otherwise have done. The season's total landings at Yarmouth and Lowestoft were almost equivalent to those of 1935, and the value of fresh herrings on landing was almost 50 per cent. higher. The gross earnings of both drifter fleets was increased by nearly 300,000%. An improvement, too, was observed in the home market. Although more fresh herring were consumed in England in pre-War days, last year showed a decided increase as a direct result of the Herring Board's advertising campaign. But it was considered that the public demand was not adequately met, chiefly on account of the policy of restricting supplies. The pickled herring, it appears, does not find favour in England; this is rather exceptional in view of the fact that it is consumed more or less in almost all European countries.

The condition of the herring fleet has given cause for some concern. While many of the company-owned English drifters have been able to continue to pay their way notwithstanding the economic depression of recent years, others have had a less fortunate career owing to the prevalence of successive financial reverses. So far as reconditioning and repairs are concerned, these in many instances were attended to without recourse to the Herring Board's loan scheme. It is considered that the number of drifters belonging to English centres is not too large, but is likely, on the contrary, to be too small, more particularly on account of the possibilities of further fishing improvements. Whether steam-driven vessels are to continue in use is questionable on account of the necessity for more economical craft and of the increasing popularity of Diesel-engined boats, which are cheaper to build, operate, and maintain than steam-drifters.

For some time past the Cornish fisheries have been in an unsatisfactory state, and owing to a steady decline in the herring, trawl, seine, and shell fishings since 1915, when there were over 600 craft passed and registered for insurance, the number last year had been reduced to 157. Many vessels had changed hands to owners outside Devon and Cornwall, owing to the inability of the Cornish crews to make the fishings pay. Some indication of the downward trend of the fisheries may be gauged from the fact

that in 1924 the sales of fish realised 700,000*l.*, whereas ten years later they amounted to about half that sum. Last year there was an over-abundance of mackerel, which had a detrimental effect on the market. These fish are now caught by drifter as well as trawl fishermen, the heaviest catches being landed by trawlers which scoop the fish in a mass into their bag-nets. Cornish fishermen have from time to time maintained that seals do extensive damage not only to the inshore fisheries but to their trammel and pollack nets, which on some occasions are cleared of practically all the fish caught in them. As it was considered that the fishermen would do much better if the seals were reduced in number, the Sea Fisheries Committee resolved to secure, if possible, permission to destroy the grey seal during September, since it is protected from then until the end of the year. A new venture which it is thought may do much to bring more prosperous times to the fishermen round the river Exe is the marketing of bottled shell-fish. It appears that trade in mussels and clam-shells flourished in Devon many years ago, but was to a considerable extent ousted by competition of foreign exports. There has, however, been a growing demand for bottled mussels in the Midlands, and there is the prospect of the shell-fish being marketed in London and various parts of the world.

The trawling industry has not had to contend with a situation such as that confronting the herring trade, but trawl-owners have, notwithstanding, experienced some measure of adversity in recent years. Fish on the North Sea as well as on the Atlantic grounds are not being caught in quantity and size equal to those of former times, and there has been a tendency for trawlers to proceed further afield, to the White Sea and the Bear Island. From these areas a rough grade of fish is usually caught, and they have frequently had a depressing effect upon the market prices. This is one of the problems which the second report of the Sea Fish Commission has in view and for which a remedy is sought. The backward condition of trawling was evidenced by the abandonment at Hull of the fleeting system, which has been in operation for many years past, by which a number of craft remained at sea for a short period, eventually transferring their catches to carrier vessels. To the existing trawler fleet, however,

about thirty new craft were added last year, and about 230 were operating from the port. It is interesting to note that half a century ago when sailing fleets went to sea from Hull an endeavour was made to prohibit steam trawling, but the enormous advantages of mechanically-propelled vessels were realised by trawling syndicates, and in time sail-driven trawlers ceased to operate.

Enterprising effort with regard to modern ideas has not been lacking at Grimsby, where motor-driven trawlers have now made their appearance. Unlike herring drifters, steam trawlers are still holding their own and many owners are reluctant to change over to internal-combustion engines. But the initial Grimsby experiments give promise of further developments, and more vessels of the new type will undoubtedly be built. Motor-trawlers are more economical to operate, their efficiency is steadily increasing, and the fact cannot be overlooked that much success has attended the voyages of oil-driven ocean-going craft. At Lowestoft also motor trawlers have commenced their career, and it is considered in this port that steam-driven vessels will soon be relegated to the past. In America, Germany, Holland and other countries, too, the economy and usefulness of Diesel-engined trawlers are appreciated and progressive development is proceeding.

A notable feature of the herring seasons, particularly at Yarmouth and Lowestoft, is the large number of women fish-workers who are employed by the various fish-curing firms. The skill and rapidity with which Scottish fisher-girls manipulate the gutting knife have often been admired by onlookers. But of late increasing numbers of fish-workers have been seeking other avenues of employment, and this has presented a problem to fish-curers, who fear that in time they may not be able to employ a sufficient number of workers for the gutting and packing of herring. Fisher girls receive fairly good wages, but they are evidently dissatisfied with the period of inactivity they experience during the winter. It appears that a Lowestoft man prominently connected with the fish trade has invented a new type of gutting knife which, it is claimed, may be used with safety even by inexperienced workers. Its operation eliminates the risk of injury to the hands, which is a constant source of trouble to fisher-girls. If the new device for fish-gutting

catches on, it is believed that the herring trade may by its use be ultimately saved many thousands of pounds.

The conservation of edible fish in the north-eastern Atlantic waters, excluding the Baltic Sea, has been the subject of international deliberation, and a Convention was recently signed on behalf of Great Britain, the Irish Free State, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Poland. France, Latvia, Finland, and Portugal were also represented at the conference, but they could not agree meantime to accept all the terms of regulations outlined. These concern principally the fixing in respect of the most important food fishes, minimum sizes below which they may not be retained on board fishing vessels, landed, or sold, and the regulation of the size of fishing net meshes in order to enable fish below these sizes to escape.

Much more intensive research into the habits of the herring is now undertaken in comparison with former years. According to a Lowestoft expert, all herring do not mature at the same age. In East Anglia the natural life of herring would be about twelve years, but in Norway they may live to twenty-four years. A forecast of the East Anglian fishery was attempted in 1929, and it was sufficiently successful to warrant a yearly forecast. Further research work revealed that the moon has an important effect upon catches and the season varied peculiarly according to the date of the full moon in October. A full moon after the eleventh of the month usually meant good catches of herring. In pre-War years it had been observed that three-year-old herring were never present in the samples selected, as they now are; but since the War there had been a decrease in the size of the net mesh used. Consequently there was a high extra rate of mortality.

We shall consider now the prospects of the fisheries in Scotland. Herring fishermen at the Scottish east-coast ports have evidently had a harder struggle for existence than those in England, and there is a marked contrast in the state of affairs to-day compared with the conditions prevailing in former years. In early times the fishermen went to sea in small open boats, the fishing grounds being within easy reach of their respective havens.

In addition to 'scaffies,' there were 'fife' and 'zulu' boats, and these were increased in size until an average length of sixty feet was attained. At every Scottish fishing port the fleets of sail vessels were steadily augmented, and they took part regularly in the Scottish and East Anglian herring fishings. Each boat furnished its complement of herring according to arrangement with one or other of the fish-curing firms. While this system held sway any excessive capture of fish was much less in evidence. When 'the bell' was introduced, however, and fish began to be auctioned, competition became keen and unlimited catching power found a foothold.

The fishermen who took part in the herring seasons with sail boats prospered, steadily gaining the business confidence of their bankers, who in turn were instrumental in promoting the ambitions of the more enterprising fishermen. The share owners of sailcraft, notwithstanding their conservative turn of mind, were alive to the possibilities of progressive development. The introduction of the drifter, some forty years ago, was at first regarded as a fruitless venture, a thoroughly impracticable proposition. But improved performance and design soon revealed that the steam-driven craft was to become a highly efficient, reliable fishing unit, with which the sailboat could not possibly hope to compete. Some of the largest vessels of the 'zulu' type in full sail could on occasion with favourable winds even overtake a drifter, but in calm weather they could not be relied upon to reach port with their catches in time for the market. The popularity of steam drifters rapidly increased and Scottish fishermen appeared to have no regrets at the passing of the sail-driven fleet, chiefly on account of the relief that drifters afforded them from much exhausting work necessitated by hoisting and lowering sails and in the general navigation of sailboats.

The boatbuilding yards on the north-east coast of Scotland throbbed with activity in pre-War days, affording employment to a large number of shipwrights and ship carpenters. Many wooden drifters about eighty feet in length were built at an average cost of 3,000*l.*, while others constructed of steel, and calculated to outlast those of wood, were rather more expensive. At the outbreak of war, the Scottish drifter fleet was in first-class

order and during the years immediately preceding it many new craft were built, while quite a number of vessels known as standard boats were hastily constructed during the war years. Owing to marketing difficulties abroad, Scottish drifter men soon became aware that steam drifters were two expensive to operate and maintain, and successive years of financial reverses gradually depleted their resources. Vessels could not be adequately repaired; some share men, being unable to carry on, had to lay up their drifters, and not a few craft depreciated in value to the extent that they were practically worthless. Fishing communities suffered as the result of much privation and many fishermen endeavoured to turn their hands to almost any kind of work that came their way.

Enterprising effort towards finding a temporary alternative to herring fishing was not lacking, and success attended a white-fish venture taken part in by a number of Moray Firth fishers, who lost no time in trying out the possibilities of seine netting. The seine, consisting of a bag-net with two long sides, was known to be very successfully employed by Danish and Norwegian fishermen, and at various Scottish ports drifters were provided with special winches and otherwise adapted for using seine nets. Instructions regarding the method of operating them were issued by fishery authorities. Long lengths of warp were paid out, the net eventually being sunk to the bottom. As it was hauled in the sides gradually closed, forcing fish that happened to be in their way into the bag.

The Scottish herring season this year has unfortunately been less successful than the previous one. This was due to a variety of causes. Instead of being able to reduce their expenditure, drifter men were faced with an increase owing to the general rise in the price of coal. The reluctance of German importers to purchase May-caught herring from Stornaway proved something of a hindrance in the early stages of the fishery. And at nearly all the herring ports with the notable exception of Lerwick herring catches on numerous occasions were light. This was unfavourable not only to fishermen but also to fish-curers as prices were above the normal. At Wick a state of affairs without precedent was witnessed, the fishing there having fallen away after an auspicious commencement owing to

the inability of the herring crews to get into touch with the fish shoals. But while the Scottish season has not been particularly remunerative, it is hoped that the East Anglian fishery, the most important of the year, will yield much better results.

One most important question from the fishery as well as from the national point of view in Scotland at present is that of herring-boat construction, which has been in abeyance almost since the War. The fishermen had been awaiting with keen interest the Herring Board's scheme for the rebuilding of the herring fleet, but when the details became known it received a mixed reception at most Scottish ports. It is, perhaps, not to be wondered at that this should be so. While the scheme admittedly is a fair proposition, it is impracticable to individual fishermen, whose resources have reached a very low level.

In view of the unsuitability of the scheme from the Scottish viewpoint, it has been asserted in some quarters that the traditional system of boat ownership in Scotland has served its day and that there should be a change over to the English method of owning herring craft. It may be that the economic factor will have a determining influence in the matter, but it is seriously doubted whether the joint-stock system would be of real benefit to the Scottish industry. The individual fishermen have always taken the greatest interest as share owners in their herring boats, and they do not desire to be deprived of the freedom of operation, which would cease to exist were they to become wage-earners in joint-stock concerns. Under normal conditions the Scottish system has invariably operated with commendable smoothness, and a steady improvement in marketing conditions is doubtless the first essential for a return to more prosperous times in the industry.

Much interest has centred in the recent report of the Herring Industry Board, mention in it having been made of the perilous position in which the industry is at present placed. From the Scottish point of view it was felt that something directly remedial to the present situation, and more of a practical nature than had so far been attempted, was essential to the salvation of the industry. In the Parliamentary discussion that followed, it became evident that various members were deeply concerned regarding

the future of the herring trade, but beyond a scheme formulated by Mr. Robert Boothby, M.P. for East Aberdeen, nothing of a very helpful character towards assisting the industry eventuated.

The plan contemplated is the formation of a co-operative company which would provide for, among other things, joint control by the Herring Board and the fishermen in the construction of new vessels, and the purchasing of supplies of fuel and gear from one centralised source.

It is clear that a continued reduction of the Scottish herring fleet is extremely undesirable because there may be a tendency for the younger class of fisherman to seek other avenues of employment, possibly the Mercantile Marine, which is stated to be in need of recruits, or trawling. Moreover, it cannot be overlooked that other countries are doing everything to improve and advance their fisheries and it is essential that the Scottish herring fleet should be augmented and maintained in all respects seaworthy.

Scottish fishermen are well aware that economy of expenditure is essential to the operation of the fisheries nowadays, and for this reason the construction of steam drifters is probably out of the question. A new type of herring boat is absolutely necessary, and the craft most suited to modern conditions is the motor drifter, which has already made its appearance in Scottish and English waters. A Fife-built drifter of the type mentioned which took part in the East Anglian fishing last year is considered to be the forerunner of many more. There are signs of some activity in the Moray Firth area, the first herring boat for a decade having recently been built at Peterhead.

When motor power was first introduced to some of the Scottish sailboats in pre-War days, fishermen were not at all enamoured of the idea that a motor-propelled craft was likely to be a success or that, at its best, it could approximate the steam drifter in performance and reliability. Happily, however, great strides have been taken in the improvement of marine engines in recent years, and this has been amply demonstrated by the steadily increasing fleet of small-sized white-fishing motor-

boats that is to be seen operating daily on various parts of the north and west Scottish coast. A large number of these boats has been constructed at Moray Firth shipyards, and while the majority of them are used for the capture of white-fish with seine nets, they are capable of being adapted for herring fishing with ring nets as well as drift nets. So rapid has been the growth of these boats at Lossiemouth that this port is no longer dependent upon herring fishing activities. It now possesses a fleet of about eighty medium-sized motor-craft that fish regularly on the inshore grounds outside the prohibited areas. The steam drifter fleet that in former years existed at Wick has now almost vanished and white-fishing has been definitely established there. A number of Danish, Norwegian, and other foreign boats land their catches at the port, their supplies being limited by quota restriction. A white-fish development has also been taking place at Buckie, a port that has been particularly hard-hit by the depression in the herring trade, and foreign seine netters are also landing their catches there. Many of the Norwegian and Danish craft are of larger size and stronger build than, although not so shapely as, the Scottish boats. They usually make several sweeps with the seine net, whereas Scottish fishermen drag the net over the fishing area.

A marked decline in small line fishing has been noticeable in recent years, and the skill that has always characterised elderly fishermen in operating the baited hook is unknown among the younger class of fishermen. In some of the coast towns and villages fisherwomen still carry home quantities of mussels in their creels from the mussel-beds to shell and bait their husbands' lines, but their number is much smaller than it was in pre-War years. Much labour is expended in connection with the lining method of capture, and while fish may not be always willing to bite, they are trapped without much difficulty with the aid of seine nets. Lining, therefore, is generally giving place to seine netting. Fishing with great lines for halibut, cod, skate, and other fish has to a considerable extent disappeared on the Scottish east coast, but a number of vessels still operate them on the west side, particularly on the Atlantic grounds, where hake, roker, conger, and skate are often found in abundance.

The ring-netting of herring is uncommon in North Scotland, and its appearance on the northern grounds a short time ago was unfavourably regarded by a number of island as well as mainland fishermen, who were of opinion that it might be detrimental to the herring fishery. Curiously enough, it was contended that extensive use of the seine net would in time deplete the white-fishing grounds, but as yet there appears to be no conclusive evidence of a scarcity due to this system of netting. It is considered that the ring net, which has been so successfully employed in the sheltered waters of Loch Fyne by fishermen operating motor skiffs, will become established in the northern area.

More attention is being devoted to the development of the shell-fish industry on the islands and mainland of northern and western Scotland. Lobsters caught on the west coast are considered to rank among the best to be found anywhere, but the trade is hampered owing to lack of proper organisation, transport, and marketing facilities. The islanders are, however, looking forward to the provision of better roads and not the least benefit likely to be conferred upon them is the new system of air services that is to operate from Greenock to the Hebrides. More depots for the disposal of lobsters prior to their dispatch to the southern markets are essential, and there is every likelihood that these will be provided in conveniently situated areas readily accessible to the crofter fishers. Acceleration of shell-fish transport is essential to the efficient operation of the industry. The conveyance of lobsters by air over a considerable distance has been proved a practical proposition on the Scottish west coast, although it still awaits development. Incidentally, an intrepid airman in British Honduras, who experimented in the freightage of lobsters over a mountainous region from one place to another, found that there was a keen demand for his crustaceans, and a weekly supply of 200 lb. has since been transported by air.

Clam-shell fishing is being given more attention than formerly owing to the high level of prices usually obtained for clams in the London market. The discovery last year of new clam beds near Girvan on the Ayrshire coast attracted a number of Scottish and Irish motor-boats, and their crews have been using special dredging nets

with which to secure the shell fish. A number of Campbeltown fishermen, owing to the failure of the herring fishery earlier in the year, made quite a successful harvest at clam fishing. In Skye and Wester Ross crofter fishermen obtain the shell-fish with the aid of glass-bottomed boxes, operating from rowing-boats in shallow water. When the sea-bed is peered at ordinarily, the view is usually blurred owing to constant motion on the surface of the water, but by immersing the box slightly in the sea and looking through the glass, the clam-shell fisher secures a clear definition, and as he spots the shells he can scoop them out with a net-covered iron hoop attached to the end of a long pole.

Trawl owners as well as trawl fishermen are evincing a keen interest in the Government's proposals for reorganisation of the white-fish industry. Trawling in many instances has not proved a paying proposition, and it has even been temporarily discontinued by a number of Scottish vessels. In the second report of the Sea Fish Commission, it is stated in regard to the white-fish trade:

'It is clear that, on the whole, there is not in this important food product a remunerative return to the producer or a satisfactory result in quality and price to the consumer; and that, while those engaged in the distributive sections are not gaining undue profits, intermediate marketing expenses are in total a heavy burden.'

The British Trawlers Federation has been instrumental in evolving a scheme framed on the basis of the Agricultural Marketing Acts, which seeks to regulate fishing craft at sea, fish landings, and desires also to ensure that the best quality fish find their way to the consumer. The Government, it appears, has approved of the scheme, which should be advantageous both to the producer and distributor. In addition, matters of general policy are to be dealt with by a Central Board while a Development Commission will attend to registration, licensing, organisation, and other duties including exploration, research, and marketing. Delay in bringing the contemplated measures into force has been deprecated by leaders in the trawling industry.

It is evident that if the fishing industry is to be advanced upon progressive lines it must be aided from the

scientific side. The success or otherwise of the fisheries must primarily depend upon the catching of sufficient quantities of herring of good quality, and it is the fishermen's job to obtain them. When fishermen reach the fishing areas they depend upon past experience in selecting the particular places in which they are to cast their drift nets. Being surface nets they are let overboard in a long perpendicular line, sometimes more than a mile in length, the top of the nets being buoyed up with numerous cork floats. A shoal of herring migrating to the surface sooner or later becomes entangled in the meshes of the nets, which eventually are hauled on board, and the catches are then carefully accommodated in the holds of the drifters.

In their searches for herring fishermen are sometimes aided by sea-birds flying near the surface of the sea or the presence of whales or basking sharks. But they can never be certain that the shoals will be abundant for any length of time. Shortly after the commencement of the Scottish season last summer herring were extremely elusive, and on numerous occasions fishermen were baffled in their efforts to regain touch with them. On occasions when difficulty is experienced in locating the herring shoals it is considered that fishermen may be assisted by electrical means. The cast method of sounding and charting is now being replaced by a much better system which necessitates the employment of an echo sounder, or echometer. This electrical instrument can evidently be installed in all kinds of steamers as well as in different types of fishing boats. When a vessel possessing the apparatus moves over a particular area electric waves are emitted from the device towards the sea-bed, and when they return to their source not only is the depth of water registered upon a meter connected up with the instrument but also 'echo-grams' of the sea-bed indicating whether it is rough or smooth.

About two years ago Norwegian fishery experts tried out the echo sounder on certain herring grounds off the coast of Norway. They were agreeably surprised to find that dense shoals of herring showed up on the 'echo-grams' at varying depths, peculiar cloud-like markings having shown on the meter. The experts at once communicated their discovery to the fishing fleet, which proceeded to the spot as directed without delay; and

they were completely successful in securing heavy catches of herring in depths that exactly corresponded to those indicated on the meter. The electrical device was tested later on the cod-fishing grounds, and not only were shoals distinctly located but the size of the fish and their directional movements were readily ascertained. The echo sounder has been found to operate successfully at the Loch Fyne fishery on the Scottish west coast. A few years ago some motor skiffs that employ ring nets for the capture of herring were fitted out with echometers with a view to detecting herring shoals, and they did so without difficulty on various occasions. The value of the ingenious sounding apparatus to trawlers is now fully appreciated, and the most modern British vessels include it in their scientific equipment. A short time ago the German trawling fleet invoked the aid of electric waves in increasing the scope of their fishing activities, and it was considered that it might be possible to discover the presence of fish that could not otherwise be revealed. Since trawlers, too, are now frequenting more distant grounds than the North Sea and the Atlantic areas, it is probable that wasted effort in trawling could be considerably reduced if full advantage is taken of the echo-sounding device.

Surveying the outlook of the fisheries as a whole, it must be said that the work of reconstruction will not only be very difficult, the process must necessarily be slow. It is anticipated, however, that everything possible will be done towards the restoration of better conditions, the revival of existing markets, and, if possible, the development of new avenues for export. The goal aimed at is more efficient organisation for the herring industry and for the white-fish trade. All engaged in the activities connected with the industrial trunk are no doubt aware of the necessity for closer co-operation than has hitherto existed. This also is essential for the preservation and improvement of the industry.

J. R. YOUNG.

Art. 11.—THE SEA-DOGS OF SCOTLAND.

THE recent appeal for funds to restore and preserve the monument known as Sir Andrew Wood's Tower, situated at the Fife village of Largo, serves to recall the fact—so little appreciated, and possibly little recognised even by Scots people—that the Scottish nation could boast her sea-dogs at least two generations before the Drakes and the Raleighs were heard of. Indeed, Scotland had attained her zenith as a maritime power at a time when, to all intents and purposes, the proud English fleet of Elizabethan days simply was non-existent. The suggestion, therefore, that this monument, which has been allowed to fall into a state of sorry dilapidation, should be placed under the care of the Ancient Monuments Commission will be acceptable to all who are conversant with the skill and prowess of Sir Andrew Wood and his seamen, and with their contribution to the founding and maintenance of the Scottish Navy during the latter years of the fifteenth century and the first few decades of the sixteenth.

Sir Andrew appears to have been a native of Leith, though Largo is commonly believed to have been his birthplace. In any event, after a successful career as merchant, shipowner, mariner, and naval tactician, he retired to Largo, where he built a castle for himself and spent the remainder of his days in developing and enjoying his estate, and doubtless in dreaming of the scenes of his naval encounters and victories, just as Drake, according to Sir Henry Newbolt, lay 'dreaming a' the time o' Plymouth Hoe' nearly three-quarters of a century later. He died at Largo in 1515 and was interred in the ancient parish church at a spot marked by a stone let into the floor and simply inscribed. All that now remains of his palatial castle is the Tower aforementioned. But the natives of Largo, with some degree of self-pride and satisfaction, still point to part of the ditch along which, according to tradition current in 'the Kingdom,' ran the canal specially constructed by Sir Andrew so as to enable him, in his declining years, to sail in his barge of state between the parish church and his residence. This barge is said to have been manned by rowers selected from amongst the old pensioners who had served with him aboard the

'Yellow Carvel,' the most historic of his ships and one of the most celebrated fighting vessels of her age.

On the face of things it seems absurd to regard mediæval Scotland as a sea-power to be reckoned with, since so little stress has been placed on the seafaring record of the Scottish nation during the reigns of James III and James IV. A national knowledge of maritime affairs, as well as the reputation of what we still speak of as 'the Scot abroad,' have not been won in modern times : on the contrary, they date back to the days of the early Stewart monarchs. This is demonstrated largely by the fact that the bulk of books, etc., printed at this time were concerned either directly or indirectly with the development of Scotland's trade upon the seas.

In estimating a nation's naval strength in mediæval days we must embrace merchant vessels as well as what were described as royal ships. This was recognised by James III when he began to build his fleet. He found it as difficult to differentiate between what strictly was a ship of war and a ship of commerce as, to-day, any reasonable person finds it difficult to distinguish between military and civil aircraft. His shipbuilding, therefore, was planned in such a way as to render it possible to convert a merchant vessel into a war vessel, or vice versa, with the greatest expedition. It would be impracticable—nay, impossible—to make a survey of Scotland's growth as a sea-power toward the close of the fifteenth century and during the opening years of the sixteenth without realising how integral a part was played by her merchant fleet. And it is of interest to remember in passing that in Scotland at this period even the king's special ships of war were used in trade and commerce, either directly by himself or by traders to whom he hired them for commercial purposes.

Whereas in England in olden days responsibility for the naval defence of the realm was placed upon a small group of favoured communities like the Cinque Ports, in Scotland the function of naval defence was performed by the royal burghs, according to their resources. In respect of such responsibility, extensive trading facilities were granted to these burghs. Thus it was that the trade of the Scottish burgesses and the development of the Scottish Navy became so interdependent. At this time, and

indeed well into the eighteenth century, Scotland's maritime activities were confined almost entirely to the east coast. This meant, obviously, that her trade routes were upon the North Sea, and explains the development of the ports of Aberdeen, Dundee, and Leith long before there was any serious commercial expansion on the Clyde. Occasionally, however, Scottish traders shared in the traffic then passing through the Narrow Seas, as the English Channel and the Strait of Dover were called by the seamen of Western Europe in olden times. They were the highway not only for English shipping, but also for the proud merchant-vessels owned by the maritime communities of Venice, of Genoa, and of Spain and Portugal. These communities were now developing a lucrative trade with such Hanse ports as Bruges, Hamburg, and Lubeck. But as fast as the Narrow Seas offered trade routes for valuable merchandise, they also became infested with the pirates of all nations. Even corsairs hailing from Leith frequented the southern waters. The sober merchant-seamen of Leith, therefore, felt that if they meant to develop a legitimate and expanding trade, they would be obliged to concentrate their attention upon the trade routes afforded by the North Sea, which at that period was comparatively free from piracy and offered excellent opportunities for peaceful commerce between Scotland and the ports of Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and the Baltic. Thus it was that the Scottish traders found it much to their advantage to establish and maintain a strong commercial relationship with ports like Bruges, Middelburg, and Veere, which soon became the staples, or depôts, of their foreign trade. Through Bruges they were able to trade not only directly with Flanders, but also indirectly with France.

During this period Leith retained a position of prime importance. Not until the ascendancy of Glasgow, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, did it become the second port of the country. With Leith, perhaps more than with any other Scottish seaport, are associated the names of Scotland's sea-dogs. Her development as a commercial centre soon produced a rich and powerful trading class. Under the direction of skippers like Peter Falconer and Gilbert Edmonston, the town flourished. The increasing prosperity of its traders soon attracted

the more enterprising and adventurous members of several titled and landed families to commerce and to the adoption of the sea-life as a profession. Among such Leith families who contributed toward establishing the merchant-service of Scotland were the Logans and the Bartons. The latter family, as we shall see, successfully conducted a war of spoliation on the high seas against the entire maritime might of Portugal !

One of the earliest Scottish mariners to win fame for himself and a place of prominence for his country in the maritime world was Sir Andrew Wood, to whom we have already alluded. Wood is believed to have worked his way up from humble beginnings until he became the most powerful and influential merchant in Leith. Through his achievements at sea he was the trusted friend and naval adviser of James III, during whose reign he commanded two vessels famous in Scottish history—the ' Flower ' and the ' Yellow Carvel,' both of which were of about 300 tons. The ' Flower ' was Wood's own property ; the ' Yellow Carvel ' (a name reminiscent of the caravels in which the merchants of Spain and Portugal visited the Far East as well as the American continent) belonged to the king ; but, in accordance with the practice of the time, Wood hired her at an agreed figure per voyage or per annum. Formerly the ' Yellow Carvel ' had been commanded by that doughty sea-dog, John Barton, the first of a noted family of Leith mariners. Wood sailed frequently between Leith and the Low Countries in these two vessels ; and he also visited many French seaports with them. Of his voyages in the ' Flower ' to old Dutch ports like Bergen-op-Zoom and Middelburg, we read in the fascinating ledger in which Andrew Halyburton kept the accounts of his Scottish and Netherlands clientèle. From 1493 until 1503, Halyburton held the imposing position of Lord Conservator of the Scottish Privileges in the Low Countries ; and in a private capacity he acted as agent for Scottish merchants desirous of buying or selling in the markets of the Low Countries. He was excellently situated, therefore, for obtaining first-hand information regarding the foreign activities of the merchants of Edinburgh and Leith and of Scotland's sea-dogs during the closing years of the fifteenth century. Halyburton's ledger is preserved at the Register House in Edinburgh.

It was mainly through the opportunities afforded to Wood of coming into contact with French, Portuguese, Dutch, and even English pirates, when peacefully pursuing his commercial relationships, that he developed his skill in naval strategy. So successfully did he emerge from his encounters with the pirates of various nations that in recent times he is often spoken of as the Scottish Nelson of his day. His skill as a strategist soon commended itself to King James III, who on at least two notable occasions called upon him to defend Dumbarton Castle against the fleet of Edward IV. When Archibald Bell-the-Cat and other Scottish nobles rose in rebellion against James, Sir Andrew stood firm for the king and placed both his ships and his services at the royal disposal. One of his vessels carried James across the Forth, that he might join his supporters in the north ; and it is well known that the king, in his fateful flight from the battlefield of Sauchieburn in June, 1488, was making for the shore of the Firth of Forth at Alloa, whither Sir Andrew had proceeded with a couple of ships to render him aid and to rescue him if necessary.

The rebellious nobles, following upon their success at Sauchieburn, assembled at Stirling, where Prince James, a lad of fifteen, was proclaimed as James the Fourth. With a view to obtaining the submission of the capital, they rode on toward Edinburgh and encamped on Leith Links for a couple of days, being still unaware of what exactly had happened to the defeated monarch, whose flight from the field of battle had been witnessed a few days earlier. By this time the 'Yellow Carvel' and her consort, the 'Flower,' were riding at anchor a mile or two offshore, and in what to-day are known to seamen as Leith Roads. The nobles now persuaded the young king to order Sir Andrew to appear before him and his Council that they might obtain from him information as to the fate or whereabouts of James III. But the wily commander declined to appear until two hostages of rank and circumstance had been put aboard the 'Yellow Carvel' as guarantees for his personal safety. Forthwith Lords Seton and Fleming were placed aboard his ship ; and the commander then ordered his seamen to row him in his great barge to the shore at Leith. He disembarked at the landing-place opposite what was known as the King's

Wark; and there he was confronted by the young king and the victorious lords. When questioned by the former as to whether his father, James III, was aboard any of his vessels, Wood retorted that he only wished he could say that he was, so that he might have the privilege once more of defending him against his traitor son and those who had conspired with him.

As time wore on it became obvious that, before long, James IV and his nobles would be obliged to come to some sort of understanding with Wood and his crews. Soon after the news of the fate of James III had been confirmed, Sir Andrew signified his willingness to swear allegiance to the new king, although he never quite forgave him for the part he had played in the rebellion that had culminated in the murder of his father. But it perhaps was as well for James that Wood now was prepared to overlook that unhappy episode, since the position of Scotland, both at home and abroad, was becoming increasingly insecure. At home he had to contend against 'the heavy murmur of the people' because nothing was being done to bring his father's assailants to justice: abroad 'the auld enemy' was active in promoting strife against his authority, and in aiding and abetting piracy upon the merchant vessels belonging to his burgesses. About this time, as it happened, five English vessels sailed into the Firth of Forth and began a systematic campaign of piracy. Immediate action against them was imperative. So Wood was directed to pursue them and, if possible, engage them. It is implied by Pitscottie, however, that Sir Andrew, as yet, was hardly acceptable to the new régime. This historian informs us that, only when all the other sea-captains had been approached and had declined to stand out to sea against the English pirates, was his assistance sought. Be this as it may, we do know that, despite the counsel of those who urged him to follow the English with a goodly array of vessels, he sailed down the Firth only with the 'Yellow Carvel' and the 'Flower.' Off Dunbar his ships came up with those of the English pirates. Undaunted by the apparent unevenness of the contest, this tried strategist blew his whistle for action. In the battle that ensued the five English ships were captured; and Wood escorted them into the port of Leith, where their captains and crews were held captive.

This humiliating defeat moved the English King, Henry VII, to wrath—so much so, in sooth, it is said, that he offered an annual pension of a thousand pounds to the person who succeeded in defeating or in scuttling Wood's fleet and in apprehending its leader. In pursuance of this policy Henry engaged a certain Stephen Bull, one of his most trusted mariners, to equip three ships and to sail north with them. Of Bull we know really nothing, except that he was knighted in 1512 by Sir Edward Howard in Brittany. However, Bull's vessels duly entered the Firth of Forth in the summer of 1490, and lay in hiding behind the Isle of May, ready to pounce upon Wood's two famous ships, which were known to be returning to Scotland from a voyage to Flanders, whither they had sailed partly for commercial reasons and partly as an escort for another trading vessel. At length, on a sunny morning in August, Wood's ships hove in sight, and not expecting for a moment that an enemy was in the vicinity. On perceiving the English vessels, the old sea-dog instantly gave battle. In the words of the chronicler, the contest continued 'fra the ryssing o' the sun till the gaeing doon o' the same, in the lang simmer's day, quhile all the men and women that dwelt near the coast syd stood and beheld the fighting, quhilk wes terrible tae sie.' For three days this naval battle continued, without a pause, during which time the ships, interlocked, drifted to Inchcape in the Firth of Tay. Eventually Wood and his Leith sailors defeated their foes and brought them and their vessels captive to Dundee, and later to Leith. The only details we possess of this encounter are to be found in Pitscottie's picturesque record. Pitscottie is not usually regarded as an authentic writer; and, as a rule, his chronicles are taken with a grain or two of salt, except where they are corroborated by other contemporary writers. On the other hand, it must be remembered that he and Wood were neighbouring lairds in Fifeshire, and that he, therefore, had unique opportunities for obtaining at first hand the information sought. Furthermore, Pitscottie was the boon friend of Sir Andrew Wood's son, John, and also of that other great sea-dog, Sir Robert Barton, the first skipper of the 'Great Michael,' launched in 1511. It was from Barton that Pitscottie obtained all those details of what then was the largest ship ever built, either in England or in Scotland.

The crews and their vessels were handed over by Sir Andrew to the Scottish king, who in turn presented them to King Henry with the warning that thenceforth Scottish waters would be out of bounds to pirates, and that in future malefactors upon the high seas would be treated with less clemency. To King James, King Henry replied that 'he gratefully accepted his kindness, and could not but applaud the greatness of his mind.'

The time had now arrived when it became increasingly necessary to concentrate attention on shipbuilding and naval construction. So far as Scotland was concerned, James IV, therefore, opened the sixteenth century with plans for making his kingdom a sea-power of some standing among the nations. In this endeavour he sought the assistance of Wood, who thereupon began to devote his energies to the founding and development of the king's dockyards at Leith, as well as at Newhaven, the *Novus Pontus* or New Haven of Leith. Furthermore, he enlisted the expert advice and skill of several shipwrights from Brittany and Normandy and purchased a number of French ships from private owners. Toward the close of 1502, Jean Lorans, 'the French wright that cam for the schip bigging,' arrived at Leith. Largely under his direction the good ship 'Margaret' was built—so named to celebrate the marriage of the Scots king and Margaret Tudor. Somewhere about 1507 the keel of the 'Great Michael' was laid. In her construction James sought advice chiefly from Sir Andrew Wood and from Jacques Terrell, the king's master-wright, who already had won fame not only in his own country of France, but also among the maritime nations of Europe. This ship was regarded at that time as the largest afloat; and so much timber was required for her that, according to Pitscottie, she demanded not only considerable consignments of timber from Norway, but used up all the woods of Fife, with the exception of those round Falkland Palace. This is hardly surprising when we study the vessel's dimensions as set forth by the same chronicler! Her guns, for the most part, were brought from Flanders. Some of them, however, are said to have been cast at the royal forge in Edinburgh Castle. Chandeliers and the like also came from Flanders, as did her compasses, brought to Leith by George Paterson, another Scots sea-dog of the period.

Denmark and her neighbours in the 'Estland Seys' supplied the tar. The 'Great Michael' was launched at Newhaven in October, 1511, amid great pomp and ceremony. But her day was brief and inglorious. It seems as though that mighty vessel was beyond the seamanship of the period, since there is no record of deeds befitting such a miracle in shipbuilding.

The year 1512 found King James IV supporting his French ally, Louis XII, upon whom Henry VIII of England had declared war. Almost the whole Scottish fleet, numbering some twenty-nine vessels, was victualled, to sail out of the Forth in July of the following year, carrying to France about three thousand men under the command of the Earl of Arran. King James himself escorted his fleet as far as the Isle of May, in order to give it encouragement, it is said, in the inevitable struggle to come. He then returned to lead his army to the fatal field of Flodden. A few days after the Scottish fleet had set out for France, some of Henry's war vessels sailed northward. But they sighted none of James's ships, which, to avoid the English Navy and the peril of the Strait of Dover, had sailed round the north of Scotland and down through the Irish Channel, to unite with the French fleet off Brest. Some days before his fleet reached France the king had died at Flodden. In the ensuing year peace was concluded. Scotland's vessels of war, for the most part, had never even experienced an encounter with the enemy. So far as the 'Great Michael' was concerned, the Duke of Albany, who had represented King James at the Court of Louis, sold her in 1514 to France for the meagre sum of forty thousand francs. So never again was she seen in Scottish waters. She proved as little use to the French monarch as she had been to Scotland, and ended her day rotting at her moorings in the harbour at Brest.

Throughout this time one family in particular was speedily coming into prominence among the mariners of Scotland. They were the Bartons, to members of which family we already have had occasion to allude. John Barton had three sons, each of whom has found a permanent place among the sea-dogs of Scotland—to wit, Andrew, the eldest and perhaps the most celebrated; Robert, dreaded by the English and known to them as

Hob o' Barton, though affectionately called Robin in his home-port of Leith; and John, who vied with his elder brothers in his daring escapades at sea. All three were skilled navigators and rendered James IV inestimable service in the heyday of the Scottish Navy. Andrew Halyburton's ledger shows that the Bartons carried on a regular trade between Leith and the Low Countries. Their fights in waters as distant as Norway and the Canaries were innumerable. But it is generally conceded that their fame rests rather on the way in which they conducted a sort of private family war against the naval might of Portugal, in which they were ultimately victorious. Their difference with Portugal was one of long standing. It dated back to the year 1476, when John Barton, the first of the family to come into the light of maritime affairs, was homeward bound with a valuable cargo from Sluis, in Flanders, in his ship the 'Juliana,' and was set upon by two armed Portuguese vessels. This Scots sea-dog put up a good fight; but in the end his vessel was captured and Barton and his crew were thrown into one of the boats and cast adrift. Eventually they made the shore, whence Barton immediately set out for Lisbon in the hope of obtaining from the King of Portugal redress for that act of piracy, with compensation, estimated at 12,000 ducats, for the loss of his ship. Alfonso V paid as little attention to his complaint as he did to the representation made on Barton's behalf by King James III of Scotland, who thereupon granted to the Barton family letters of reprisal, authorising them to detain and appropriate any Portuguese vessels and cargoes they desired, until they felt they had recovered the equivalent of the loss sustained by their father in the seizure of his 'Juliana.' Throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries this was the customary manner of obtaining redress for acts of wanton piracy.

About this time a number of Dutch ships set upon some Scottish merchant vessels, plundered them, and cast their owners and crews adrift. In those days the owners of ships as well as the owners of cargoes frequently sailed with them. King James instantly authorised Andrew Barton to visit the Dutch with reprisals. This he did with such expedition that before long he was sending to the king, as evidence that he had carried out his mandate

in appropriate style, several barrels full of the heads of the Dutch pirates. Meanwhile his brother, Robert, acting in accordance with letters of marque issued to him by the king himself, was despoiling the ships of Portugal in the North Sea and the English Channel. But ill-luck befell Robert Barton when, at the instance of some Portuguese shippers whom he had relieved of their cargoes, the magistrates of the Dutch town of Campvere seized his ship, the 'Lion,' and sentenced him to be hanged as a low-down pirate unless he could restore the cargoes he had taken or pay handsome compensation in lieu of them. However, news of the detention of the 'Lion' and of the fate that hung over its commander soon reached the ears of James IV, who immediately communicated with Margaret of Savoy, demanding that this valiant sea-dog, together with his ship and crew, should be released without delay, on the ground that his action against the Portuguese had been justified under letters of marque. The result was that, as anticipated, Robin and his crew were set free, and the 'Lion' was able to resume her functions upon the high seas.

In 1508, in pursuance of the friendly alliance that had existed between the Scottish people and the Danes since the marriage of James III with Margaret of Denmark—an alliance that greatly encouraged trading between Leith and Copenhagen—Andrew Barton sailed with two ships to assist Denmark in her commercial war with the powerful Hanseatic League. At the same time he did not neglect to take what he could from the treasure-laden ships of Portugal, thus increasing the resentment of the London merchants, whose trade to a large extent he now had ruined. Greatly as this annoyed Henry VIII, he does not seem to have made any complaint to the Scottish monarch, though it is known that he resented the way in which the sea-dogs of Scotland continued to outwit those of his own kingdom. Nothing pleased him better, therefore, than to grant the request of the Howards, that they be permitted to equip an expedition against the Bartons, despite the fact that the merest mention of the Leith mariners put the fear of death on most English crews at the time. The Howards came up with Barton in the Downs, as he was sailing aboard the 'Lion,' attended by her pinnace, the 'Jenny Pirwin.' Contrary to maritime

practice, the English seamen displayed no ensigns on their vessels, as was the custom with war vessels, particularly in time of hostilities. Instead, they placed willow wands on the masts, 'as merchants use that sayle the sea.' Though the odds were heavily against Barton, he engaged the enemy, encouraging his sailors in their death-struggle by blowing the famous whistle said to have been suspended from a gold chain round his neck.

"Fight on, my men," Sir Andrew says,
"And never flinch before the foe ;
And stand fast by St. Andrew's Cross,
As long as ye hear my whistle blow."

Clad in the conspicuous dress worn by the Scottish sea-dogs of the period, Andrew Barton was a mark for the enemy. Early in the conflict he fell mortally wounded ; but, as long as breath remained in him, he continued to blow his whistle. When eventually the Howards' seamen boarded the 'Lion' they found its intrepid commander dead. Thus passed Andrew Barton, as he had lived. The 'Lion' was now brought into the Thames by his foes ; and surely it redounds to the credit of the Scottish ship-builders of the time that, at a later date, she was re-christened the 'Great Harry' and became the largest war vessel in the English fleet !

ALASDAIR ALFIN MACGREGOR.

Art. 12.—THE PALESTINE REPORT.

The Palestine Royal Commission Report. Cmd. 5479. 1937.

THE Royal Commission on Palestine was appointed on Aug. 7, 1936, but waited three months before going out on account of the disturbances ; it arrived in Jerusalem on Nov. 11, and left on Jan. 18, 1937. Between those dates the Commissioners visited many of the Zionist colonies and the Arab industrial towns and villages, held thirty public and forty private sessions, and took the evidence of one hundred and thirteen witnesses. On their return to England they examined other witnesses, both in public and in private sessions. In Palestine the Zionists were at first the only witnesses, as the Arabs boycotted the Royal Commission after the Colonial Secretary's pronouncement in Parliament that Jewish immigration would be somewhat restricted but not suspended while the Commission was in session. Much of the Commissioners' early information on the Arab question, therefore, was derived indirectly, filtering through the evidence of the Jews themselves and of British witnesses. Towards the end, the Arabs decided to give evidence—wisely and, as it happened, not too late. The members of the Royal Commission were Earl Peel (Chairman), Sir Horace Rumbold, Sir Laurie Hammond, Sir Morris Carter, Professor R. Coupland, and Sir Harold Morris, all men of high public distinction and experience. Their terms of reference were as follows :

'To ascertain the underlying causes of the disturbances which broke out in Palestine in the middle of April ; to inquire into the manner in which the Mandate for Palestine is being implemented in relation to the obligations of the Mandatory towards the Arabs and Jews respectively ; and to ascertain whether, upon a proper construction of the terms of the Mandate, either the Arabs or the Jews have any legitimate grievances upon account of the way in which the Mandate has been, or is being, implemented ; and if the Commission is satisfied that any such grievances are well founded, to make recommendations for their removal and for the prevention of their recurrence.'

This Report will be a model for similar documents, for thoroughness and lucidity and for the high sense of

responsibility it displays. Unfortunately, its usefulness is limited by the disbelief of Arabs, British, and Jews in Palestine in the efficacy of Commissions and Reports generally, the recommendations of earlier ones having been shelved or explained away subsequently by Government.

It was necessary for the Commission to dig deep into history for the roots of trouble, and five able chapters carry us over the rough ways of Palestinian history from pre-Christian days to 1936. From this 'Historical Background' emerge facts of lasting historical importance: (1) The Israelite Period was a short one amongst the other historical phases; the entry of the Tribes into Palestine was circa 1300 B.C., Saul was made king circa 1075 B.C., and the First Great Captivity was circa 597 B.C.; the Northern Kingdom broke away very soon (circa 970 B.C.), and though 'the two Kingdoms succeeded in maintaining a precarious independence for some 200 years' (circa 721 B.C.), Israel was never again one sovereignty. (2) The Israelites never held the whole of Palestine; considerable portions of it remained in the hands of the Philistines, Canaanites and other indigenous peoples, who were there when the Tribes came and there when they left, and whose descendants are there now. "Other lords have had rule over us!" was the prophet's lament; and in turn Philistia, Egypt, Assyria, Rome, Byzantium, Arabia, Turkey were lords over Palestine. 'In 63 B.C. Pompey stormed Jerusalem. Never since then has Palestine been an independent State.' Jewish Palestine ended in A.D. 135, with the defeat of the heroic Bar-Cochba by Hadrian. For 500 years Palestine was under Roman and Byzantine rule; between A.D. 639-45, the Arabs overran the East, and, with the brief interlude of the Crusading Kingdom (1089-1187), Palestine remained in Moslem hands until 1917.

'To ascertain the underlying causes of the disturbances which broke out in Palestine in the middle of April' (1936).

Mr Winston Churchill, when Colonial Secretary, stated in the House of Commons that 'the only cause of unrest in Palestine arose from the Zionist Movement, and from our promises and pledges in regard to it' (June 14, 1921). British statesmen hoped that when the Arabs saw material advantage following the Jewish influx, their objections

would disappear; but intensive Jewish immigration intensified Arab opposition, and such statements as Dr Weizmann's, that Zionism aimed at 'making Palestine just as Jewish as America is American and England is English,' increased the disharmony. The volume of Jewish immigration rose yearly: in 1920 it was 5514, in 1930 it was 30,327, in 1936 it was 61,854, of which 53 per cent. came from Poland, 9 per cent. from Germany, and none at all from the British Empire. The development of nationalism within the Arab countries coincided with this influx, but its existence in Palestine was disregarded because at first it lacked cohesion and direction; and so, while Trans-Jordan was recognised as an 'independent Government' (under the Palestine Mandate) in 1923, Iraq obtained full independence in 1932, and the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936 acknowledged Egypt as a Sovereign State, the 900,000 Arabs of Palestine alone had no hopes of independence held out to them.

'In that stark contradiction between Arab aspirations and British obligations (i.e. to Zionism) lay, and had always lain, the one insurmountable crux. The rates of Jewish immigration might rise or fall, Jewish land-purchase might be extended or restricted, . . . these were only subsidiary factors. They might add fuel to the flames or damp them down. But the Mandate itself . . . had lighted the fire; and the Mandate itself, however applied and interpreted, was bound to keep it burning—except on the old original assumption that the two races could and would learn to live and work together.'

Palestine is about the size of Wales and very much of its configuration; it has a virile though illiterate peasantry, descended from Canaanitish and other primitive stocks which have been conquered and intermixed during centuries of war and spoliation, but never uprooted. Their passionate attachment to the soil has been unsuspected, because it found expression only when the large purchases of land by Jewish organisations appeared to them to threaten their dislodgment. In the towns the Arabs turn to affairs, business, commerce, local government; they may go abroad to make a fortune, but only that they may return to spend it in their own land and upon their own kindred; then they establish themselves upon the land, buying a plot and building their own house

in which they live. The well-to-do Arab who wishes to invest his money in Palestine deeply resents the obstacles in his way ; for instance, no Arab capital was invited for either of the big Concessions by which the whole of the water and electrical power and the exploitation of the amazing resources of the Dead Sea were leased to two Jews of Russian origin, though wealthy Moslem communities in India were anxious to assist.

Educated in English mission-schools in relations of complete friendliness with their English teachers, the young Arab men and women of pre-War Palestine found English games, books, manners, and ideals wholly admirable. They marked the growing prosperity of Egypt, the opening up of the Sudan, and traced in both the inspiration of England. When Lord Kitchener was appointed to Cairo, the humble folk hailed it as a prelude to Palestine being joined to Egypt and so coming under British rule ; when a rumour arose that five British generals were coming to take Jerusalem, crowds went out hopefully to meet the evening train. We may smile at the simplicity of the thought, but never at the genuine feeling for England that inspired it. The War came, and the Arabs hid their best clothes 'to wear when the English come,' so sure they were that deliverance would come through her. Many suffered imprisonment because of their pro-British sympathies ; numbers of Arab conscripts deserted from the Turkish ranks to the British ; and a rain of leaflets from British aeroplanes promised them their liberty after the War. When the Military Administration was established, it found ready to its hand a number of young Arab men and women, knowing English perfectly, eager and competent to serve in various Departments. In no other liberated territory did the Mandatory Power find similar conditions ; yet other Mandated Territories have prospered under British rule, while in Palestine, after twenty years, are found bitterness, discontent, suspicion, risings. These are not the usual concomitants of British rule. Colonel T. E. Lawrence, in a letter to 'The Times' (July 22, 1920), wrote : 'The Arabs rebelled against the Turks during the War not because the Turk Government was notably bad, but because they wanted independence. They did not risk their lives in order to change masters, to become British

subjects or French citizens, but to win a show of their own.' He referred to Mesopotamia, but his words apply equally to Palestine.

We come to the negotiations between the Sherif of Mecca (afterwards King Hussein) and Sir Henry McMahon, in 1915. The Commissioners consider that their terms of reference did not 'require them to undertake the detailed and lengthy research among the documents of twenty years ago which would be needed for a full re-examination of this issue.' But is not this *the* issue, the point upon which the whole problem turns—was Palestine included or not within the areas then specified? A re-examination of the documents, therefore, is absolutely necessary, and Parliament should demand their production now, while the question of a new Mandate is before Geneva. Every British citizen has the right to know exactly how he stands in regard to pledges given in his name, though without his knowledge. As the Report says: 'It was in the highest degree unfortunate that, in the exigencies of war, the British Government were unable to make their intentions clear to the Sherif. Palestine, it will be noticed, was not expressly mentioned in Sir Henry McMahon's letter of Oct. 24, 1915'—which said, 'The districts of Mersina and Alexandretta and the portions of Syria lying to the west of the districts of Damascus, Homs, Hama, and Aleppo, cannot be said to be purely Arab, and should be excluded from the proposed limits and boundaries.' According to the map inserted here in the Report, Palestine lies south of these excepted areas. The Report points out that the term Syria 'had long included Palestine'; indeed, the Arabs of pre-War Palestine often spoke of themselves as Syrians. It would be impossible for the Arab idea on this point not to appear when the actual territory was under discussion. If Palestine is not 'expressly' included in the McMahon correspondence, neither is it 'expressly' excluded; no one who knows the people and the areas under consideration in 1915 believes that King Hussein would have deliberately excluded from Arab interests Jerusalem, the third Holy City of Islam; as Sherif of Mecca he would not have dared to do so had he wanted to.

Turkey's former Arab subjects everywhere 'had been encouraged to hope that victory would mean the full

realisation of their independence.' One of President Wilson's Fourteen Points, which the Allied Powers had accepted, decreed that non-Turkish 'nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an . . . absolutely undoubted opportunity of autonomous development.' Then came a Joint Declaration by the French and British Governments :

'The object aimed at by France and Great Britain in prosecuting the War in the East is the complete and definite emancipation of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks, and the establishment of National Governments and Administrations deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of the indigenous populations. . . . (They) are at one in encouraging and assisting the establishment of indigenous Governments and Administrations in Syria and Mesopotamia. . . . Far from wishing to impose on the populations of these regions any particular institutions, they are only concerned to secure by their support and by an adequate assistance the regular working of Governments and Administrations freely chosen by the populations themselves' (November 1917).

Herein again the Arabs understood Palestine to be included in the term 'Syria.' After the War the Syrians proclaimed Emir Feisal King of Syria and Palestine (March 1920); but France 'vehemently opposed' this, and in August a French army 'expelled' him from Damascus and occupied Syria.

In June 1916 the Sherif declared war against the Turks. His lead steadied and determined the other Arab tribes beyond the Hedjaz, and when the British army entered Palestine in 1917, 'the co-operation of the Arab forces beyond the Jordan was unquestionably a factor in the success of the campaign.' While it was 'undoubtedly the Sherif's own people who bore the brunt of the actual fighting,' as the campaign proceeded in Palestine the Turks 'were seriously embarrassed by their inability to count on the loyalty of their Arab subjects.'

'To enquire into the manner in which the Mandate for Palestine is being implemented in relation to the obligations of the Mandatory towards the Arabs and Jews respectively; and to ascertain whether, upon a proper construction of the terms of the Mandate, either the Arabs or the Jews have any

legitimate grievance upon account of the way in which the Mandate has been, or is being, implemented.'

The Commissioners carefully examined the records bearing on the Mandate: 'It is clear to us (they say) that the words "the establishment in Palestine of a National Home" were the outcome of a compromise between those Ministers who contemplated the ultimate establishment of a Jewish State, and those who did not. It is obvious that H.M. Government could not commit itself to the establishment of a Jewish State. It could only commit itself to facilitate the growth of a Home.' The Balfour Declaration was embodied in the Palestine Mandate; from documents drafted by leading Zionists, 'it is clear that the Zionist project had already assumed something like the shape of the Mandate as we know it.'

Though the Mandate is dated in 1922, the Zionist and other Jewish agencies had started work already; the Jewish National Home has been in existence for nearly twenty years, which seems a reasonable period whereby to judge of its ultimate practicability. The Commissioners describe fully the work of these Jewish organisations, the remarkable growth in numbers, the colonies, the flow of material prosperity, the reclamation of waste lands in Jewish-owned areas. Article 4 of the Palestine Mandate provided that

'an appropriate Jewish Agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine (i.e. upon matters of purely Jewish concern), and subject always to the control of the Administration, to assist and take part in the development of the country. The Zionist Organisation, so long as its organisation and constitution are, in the opinion of the Mandatory, appropriate, shall be regarded as such agency.'

There are various subsidiary Jewish organisations at work in Palestine: the Jewish National Fund, for the acquisition of land, the Palestine Foundation Fund responsible for agricultural settlement, a Workers' Bank, organised upon a co-operative basis. 'The ideal of the National Home is a purely Jewish ideal. The Arabs hardly come into the picture except when they force an entry with violence and bloodshed. . . . The average Jew goes on with his work and tries to forget about the

Arabs.' Land in Jewish ownership rose from 844,000 *dunums* in 1925 to 1,332,000 *dunums* in 1936 (a *dunum* is about three-quarters of an acre). 'There are now 203 agricultural settlements, containing some 97,000 people. . . . Three parts of the Plain of Esdraelon, all the Valley of Jezreel, a great part of the Maritime Plain between Jaffa and Mount Carmel, and another large area south of Jaffa . . . are the agrarian basis of the National Home.' Practically every Jewish child attends school, usually a Jewish school, where 'the instruction is in Hebrew and the course of work is planned to impregnate the pupils with the Hebrew tradition.' As a result of this intensive education, 'the civic sense of Jewish youth in Palestine is not Palestinian except in so far as in theory or in prospect Palestine is identified with the National Home.'

The Arab population has also risen remarkably since 1920, when it was 600,000 ; it is now about 950,000. The *effendi* no longer hold office to the extent they did under Turkey, but 'a steadily increasing number of educated Arabs have obtained posts in Government service since the British Occupation, and some of them high-salaried posts.' The grade of these posts is not specified. Arab landowners have sold land (to Jews) at prices far above pre-War rates, resulting in substantial investments of capital. Arab citrus plantations in the Maritime Plain now cover 135,000 *dunums*, and represent an investment of 6,500,000*l.* The number of Arab industrial undertakings, which was about 1200 before the War, had risen in 1933 to about 2200.

'Unhappily, the standard of living is still low amongst the *fellaheen*, who form the majority of the Arab population and are the dominant factor in any estimate of Arab Palestine. They have suffered from the world-wide fall in prices, from severe and repeated droughts and consequent bad harvests. . . . The Government has done much to relieve them by reducing and remitting taxation and providing loans. . . . The development of co-operation is slow, but over 60 Arab Co-operative Societies are now in existence. . . . There is one point on which the *fellaheen* have lost ground. In 1920 they had little enough land on which to maintain themselves. Their numbers have greatly increased, and to-day there are many for whom no land is available.'

The official estimate for Arab unemployment is 6000. We think that the Commissioners have not grasped the full reason for Arab unemployment (there was none under Turkey), and for the bitterness of feeling amongst all classes of Arabs at the loss of land. After the War the Arabs had little to sell except their land, and they needed money urgently; only the Jewish agencies had money for land purchase. Other land belonged to absentee landlords, who sold it regardless of the claims of the tenant-farmers, whose tenures were of such long duration that they had come to look on the land as their own. The sales might profit the landlords, but the fellah's compensation, if any, was small, and he had no idea of how to use cash. It was soon gone, his living was gone too, and he attributed his loss and poverty to Jewish action backed by the British Government. The Commissioners consider that the Arabs share to a considerable degree in the material benefits induced by Jewish immigration, though the Arabs denied this outright, and that their economic position is not prejudiced so far by the National Home: 'The obligations of the Mandate in this respect have been observed.' But they 'would add a rider to that judgment.' The continuance of this economic benefit depends on the continuance of the prosperity of the National Home; in a serious set-back or widespread unemployment 'Arab labour would be the first to suffer.' And such economic benefit will 'steadily decrease and ultimately disappear if the political breach continues to widen.'

The first High Commissioner (1920-25) was Sir Herbert Samuel, whose desire to be fair to all parties was recognised by the Arabs, though his task was not eased by the Zionist claim: 'We put him in that position; he is our Samuel, he is the product of our Jewry.' The appointment of a non-Christian as the first High Commissioner in the Holy Land was unwelcome to the large Christian communities there, especially perhaps to the Latins. Many of the higher posts in the Administration were held by Jews. Hebrew was made one of the three official languages, though only about 1 per cent. of the population spoke it then; the revival of Hebrew and the output of literature in Hebrew are amongst the remarkable features of Zionism, but few of the Zionist immigrants

can speak it when they arrive in Palestine. Immigration has been accelerated, and the Jews, who in 1917 numbered about 80,000, now number 400,000. The Commissioners consider that 'as regards immigration, the Mandate has been fully implemented,' but 'in the hills there is now no more room for further close settlement by Jews; in the plains it should only be allowed under certain restrictions.'

As soon as the Palestine Arabs understood the meaning to them of the Jewish National Home, they opposed it. At first they protested to deaf ears. The first Arab Delegation to England (1921) broke their journey at Geneva on purpose to see Mr Balfour, who wrote in answer to their request that 'he had had the honour and the pleasure of seeing Dr Weizmann recently in London on the question of Palestine.' When they asked for the British Government's definition of the term 'a Jewish National Home' they were asked to see Dr Weizmann and come to an understanding with him. The columns of the British press were not always open to both sides. These are small points in themselves, but worth mentioning because they were taken in Palestine as meaning, first, that British statesmen had no answer to the Arab Case and so dared not hear it; and second, as proof that Jewish influence in England was stronger than the traditional English sense of fair play. These impressions have never been quite lost. The effect in England of not knowing both sides was unfortunate; people lost interest in Palestine and an abysmal ignorance about it grew up amongst all classes, including politicians.

The Military Administration was followed by the Civil, and the officials of both did their best to work a Mandate whose obligations 'then, as always, made the task of reconciliation not only supremely difficult, but, as we now think, impossible.' Sir Herbert Samuel was followed by Lord Plumer (1925). During his three years of office (all that his health allowed), he broke down many barriers, and feelings of security and hope grew up. The country was controlled no longer by military, but by a small force of mounted and unmounted police, Arab, British, and Jewish, numbering 125 officers and 1627 other ranks. There was a Trans-Jordan Frontier Force composed of four companies (16 British officers and 15 other ranks, and 744 Christians, Jews, and Moslems). In 1926-27 expen-

diture on defence was nil ; in 1930, it cost 109,675*l*. The Shaw Commission (1930) thought the garrison had been reduced below safety level ; old residents believe that if Lord Plumer's policy had been continued in his spirit of firmness and understanding of the East, it would have been wholly justified. There have been five High Commissioners and four risings, Lord Plumer's régime alone being a white one in this respect. Each rising has been a little more serious than the last, and a new spirit of hard determination is growing up in Arab minds, making it increasingly difficult for the moderate element to act.

The Palestine Administration has allowed to grow up and develop two wholly party organisations : the Moslem Supreme Council and the Jewish Agency. The latter (says the Report) 'has used to the fullest extent the position conferred on it by the Mandate. In the course of time it has created a complete administrative apparatus. This powerful and efficient organisation amounts, in fact, to a Government existing side by side with the Mandatory Government.' The Moslem Supreme Council (established by Order, 1921) is described as 'an Arab *imperium in imperio*. . . . The Mufti (who is president) is now such a power in the land that, supported by the National Councils in the different towns, he may truthfully be described as the head of yet a third parallel Government.' 'The Administration of Palestine is in a vicious circle, which will have to be broken sooner rather than later,' is the Commissioners' view.

The Commissioners emphasise the contrast between the highly organised Jewish Agency, with wide financial and political influences at its disposal, and the lack of machinery possessed by the Arabs for presenting their case in Palestine or England, which puts them at a profound disadvantage. They suggest that an Arab Agency be formed in London and in Palestine, which shall include also representatives from Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, and perhaps Egypt ; this 'would restore the balance and enable the Arabs to secure a full hearing, and give (them) the assurance that their interests had not suffered through any lack of force or skill in the presentation of their case.' A similar suggestion by the Government was rejected by the Arabs in 1923 ; we trust they would be better advised now.

Chapter IV deals with the 1936 disturbances, which need only be outlined here. The Arab general strike began on April 19 and ended on Oct. 12; sympathetic messages and contributions to strike funds came from India, Egypt, the Sudan, and Iraq. In April two Jews were murdered by Arab bandits, and the next night two Arabs were murdered in reprisal. Acts of terrorism increased in number and in area; sniping became common, roads were mined, railway lines and bridges destroyed, and the oil pipe-line across the Plain of Esdraelon was repeatedly punctured. The Palestine Administration fumbled badly. It accepted memoranda from Arab officials which 'definitely asserted that distrust of the Government's good faith was justified and definitely condemned its policy'; and it appealed for troops—and yet more troops—to restore order. By the end of September there were about 20,000 British troops in Palestine, complete with tanks, aeroplanes, machine-guns, armoured cars, and a G.O.C. Palestine Forces. It allowed Fawzi el-Din el-Kauwakji, a Syrian of good military reputation, to drill bands and instruct them in trench-warfare, and once at least to appear openly in Jerusalem and to leave it at his own time; and it used the troops to collect fines and requisitions in kind, which were properly police duties in non-enemy territory. Through no fault of their own, the soldiers have lost in Palestine much of the prestige and affection they had justly gained in 1917 for chivalry and humanity. It imposed heavy fines upon offending towns; and it used the R.E. to demolish houses in Jaffa under guise of 'opening up and improving the Old City.' These demolitions, which rendered 6000 Arabs homeless, were condemned subsequently by the Chief Justice and the Senior Puisne Judge in their judgment on a private claim for compensation. They censured 'the singularly disingenuous lack of moral courage displayed by the Administration in the whole affair. . . . It would have been more creditable if the Government, instead of endeavouring to throw dust in people's eyes by professing to be inspired with æsthetic or other quasi-philanthropic motives, such as those concerned with town-planning or public health, in the demolition which was contemplated, had said truthfully that it was primarily for defensive purposes, which one may assume means enabling the

forces of the military or police easier means of access in the congested areas in the town.'

'If the Commission is satisfied that such grievances are well founded, to make recommendations for their removal, and for the prevention of their recurrence.'

In the Commissioners' view, 'The situation in Palestine has reached a deadlock.' While the Administration have tried 'to discharge the contradictory obligations of the Mandate by holding the balance between Jews and Arabs,' attempts at conciliation 'have only increased the trouble.' Steps taken by the Administration to enforce law and order have proved ineffectual:

'The elementary duty of providing public security has not been discharged. . . . The concession to the Palestine Electric Corporation has obstructed any development of irrigation from the Jordan. . . . The revenues of Palestine have developed rapidly, but far too large a proportion has had to be devoted towards meeting the charges of public security. . . . The apparently large surplus is little more than a reasonable balance for existing commitments.'

Arab grievances are summarised thus:

- (1) The failure to develop self-governing institutions;
- (2) The acquisition of land by the Jews;
- (3) Jewish immigration;
- (4) Use of Hebrew and English as official languages;
- (5) Employment of British and Jewish officers, and exclusion of Arabs from the higher posts;
- (6) Creation of a large class of landless Arabs, and the refusal of Jews to employ Arab labourers;
- (7) Inadequate funds for Arab education.

The Commissioners believe 'these grievances are sincerely felt,' but are not legitimate under the terms of the Mandate; therefore 'it is only in regard to the last that we are able to suggest any remedy'; i.e. 'increased expenditure on Arab education, especially in the direction of village and agricultural schools. These financial claims should be regarded as secondary only to those of public security.' We consider that (5) and (6) are legitimate grievances also, and if not tackled they spell danger for the country and the Administration. If the 'attitude of Arab officials precludes any extension of their employ-

ment in higher posts of the Administration, including the Judiciary,' we remember that precisely the same argument was advanced in India during many years.

'The main Jewish grievances' make a list of ten items, occupying three and a half pages; they cover a wide field and indicate a large discontent. Obstruction of the establishment of the National Home. Display of pro-Arab proclivities by officials and their failure to carry out the Mandate. Inefficiency in criminal procedure—eighty Jews were murdered during 1936 and no capital sentence carried out. Toleration by Government of subversive activities, more especially those of the Mufti. Reluctance to facilitate immigration. Failure to ensure public security. Trans-Jordan should be opened to Jewish immigration—these are only a few. Is there a way out of all this? Partition seems to the Commissioners to 'offer at least a chance of ultimate peace.' They do not underestimate the difficulties; 'the closer the question is examined, the clearer they stand out. . . . Nevertheless, when one faces up to them, these difficulties do not seem so insuperable as the difficulties inherent in the continuance of the Mandate, or in any other alternative arrangement.' In brief the scheme is this:

'The Mandate should end and be replaced by a Treaty System in accordance with the precedent set by Iraq and Syria.' A new Mandate for the Holy Places should be instituted, giving access to the sea through a corridor including Lydda and Ramleh and terminating at Jaffa; Nazareth and the Sea of Galilee to be included in this new Mandate, which would be charged also with the protection of all places sacred to either Jews or Arabs which fall within each other's territory. 'The natural principle for partition is to separate the areas in which the Jews have acquired land and settled from those wholly or mainly occupied by Arabs.' Jewish colonies are mostly to be found in the Maritime Plain between Al Mejdal and Mt Carmel in the neighbourhood of Haifa, in the Plain of Esdraelon and the Valley of Jezreel, and in the east of Galilee, i.e. south of Tiberias on the shores of the Lake near Safad and in the Huleh Basin. The rest of Galilee and the northern part of the Plain of Acre 'are almost wholly in Arab occupation, as also the central hill-country of old Samaria and Judea, except for

Jerusalem and its vicinity. Nablus, Jenin, and Tulkaram are centres of Arab nationalism ; eastward to the Jordan between the Dead Sea and in the area stretching south and south-east of Beersheba to the Egyptian frontier, the population is entirely Arab, though the Jews have bought some isolated blocks of land here.' The scheme includes a reasonable allowance within the boundaries of the Jewish State for growth of population and colonisation, and reasonable compensation to the Arab State for loss of land and revenue ; the Jewish State is to pay a subvention to the Arab State when partition comes into effect. This inter-State subvention would adjust the financial balance in Palestine, but as Trans-Jordan, which is included in the Arab State, is still unable to meet the cost of administration out of revenue, Parliament should be asked to make a grant of 2,000,000*l.* to the Arab State. The Commissioners' recommendation of ' a joint port for Jaffa and Tel-Aviv ' is unsound and impracticable ; both are near enough to Haifa to be served easily by it ; such a port would be costly to make and more costly to maintain, and would almost certainly start up a lucrative gun-running trade. The coast line must remain in the sole and unfettered control of Great Britain.

What hope of peace does partition offer ? In the Commissioners' view : (1) it will give the Arabs national independence, and admit of co-operation on equal terms with neighbouring Arab states in the cause of Arab unity and progress ; (2) it finally delivers them from the fear of being swamped by the Jews, and the possibility of ultimate subjection to Jewish rule ; (3) it limits finally the Jewish National Home within a fixed frontier, and the new Mandate for the protection of the Holy Places removes all anxiety lest these should ever come under Jewish control. To the Jews, partition : (1) secures the establishment of the National Home, relieved of all possibility of future subjection to Arab rule, wherein the vexed question of immigration is determinable by themselves ; (2) attainment of the primary object of Zionism, a Jewish Nation planted in Palestine, whose nationals have the same status in the world as any other ; and they will cease to live a minority life. To both peoples it offers a prospect, which the Commissioners see in no other plan, of attaining the inestimable boon of peace.

The Jews object that Jerusalem is placed outside the National Home, robbing Zionism of Zion; the area of the Jewish State is unduly small, and the Dead Sea falls within the Arab lot; Zionism has not failed, it has been thwarted by the faulty working of the Mandate by England and her surrender to Arab terrorism; and where can the Jews go except to Palestine? On Aug. 13 'The Jewish Chronicle' published what purported to be a confidential report of a conversation between the Colonial Secretary and Dr Weizmann, which was read at the Zionist Conference of 1937. Dr Weizmann is reported as saying that if the Admiralty 'tried to collar Haifa, we should make things extremely unpleasant for them at Geneva.' He 'then took up the question of the temporary Mandates over the four towns in the Jewish State. Mr Ormsby Gore agreed that these should be liquidated as soon as possible. . . . I referred to the exclusion of the Potash Works and the Rutenberg Electric Power Station from the Jewish State. Mr Ormsby Gore said that Lord Lytton and Mr Rutenberg had been sitting on him for the last ten days. He added that the matter would have to be adjusted.' We await confidently the Colonial Secretary's public and satisfactory explanation of a report the reaction to which in Palestine must be highly prejudicial to British prestige and to peace.

The Arab objections to partition were submitted to the Permanent Mandates Commission and the Colonial Secretary in a Memorandum (July 23, 1937). They say that the Jewish State includes districts entirely Arab, i.e. Acre district contains 50,000 Arabs and 63 Arab villages against one Jewish village with 300 inhabitants; seven-eighths of the total orange-groves fall within the Jewish state, also hundreds of Arab mosques, churches, religious foundations, cemeteries, and *wagf* (Moslem religious entail) property; they recall with serious misgiving the fate of other religious sites and premises in areas where Jews have acquired control—'mosques and cemeteries have completely disappeared'; the proposed Mandatory zone includes almost all the remaining fertile parts now largely in Arab hands; the zone would cut through Arab-owned land and further prevent Arab territorial unity; the Arab state is a mountainous and barren region, restricted by artificial frontiers on three

sides ; they view with dismay the area containing the shrines holiest to Islamic and Christian sentiment permanently removed from Arab control. They forcibly repudiate partition, and demand independence on the principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the promises made to King Hussein, and the replacement of the British Mandate by a treaty similar to those between Great Britain and Iraq and Egypt, under which they will safeguard reasonable British interests, preserve and give right of access to all the Holy Places, and protect legitimate Jewish rights in Palestine.

To sum up : The Royal Commission recommends partition as the only possible solution. The British Government declares its intention of carrying out the recommendations of the Commissioners. The League Mandates Commission suggests Arab and Jewish self-governing Cantons under a British Mandate, or else two Mandates, one Jewish, one Arab, remaining under British control until each is ready for self-government. Arabs and Jews reject partition. Certain impressions develop here. It is clear from the Report that Great Britain has literally fulfilled the first part of her obligations under the Mandate ; ' facilitated ' by her, a Jewish National Home has been established in Palestine ; she is now free to fulfil her charge towards the ' non-Jewish communities.' The new Mandate should be for a specified period ; ten years is long enough to test what hopes of peace it affords. The Arab and Jewish States should be represented equally with the Mandatory Power upon the League Mandates Commission. They should deal with the Foreign Office, and not with the Colonial Office. ' New wine must be put into new bottles.' The present Palestine officials would be hampered at every step by legacies of the old Mandate in trying to work the new. A general replacement of officials seems advisable, beginning at the top.

The problem of Jewish expulsions from Europe is soluble only by each country affected ; to eject the Jews so that they may settle in Palestine is, in effect, to force Great Britain to carry burdens which Poland or Germany or any other country finds irksome. Nothing is gained by substituting an Arab question for a Jewish. Islam everywhere supports the Arabs of Palestine. Iraq may decide to come openly to their aid—she is moving steadily away

from England in her policy—and if she does, Palestine may follow Iraq towards Fascism, not because Fascism is natural or particularly acceptable to the Arabs, but because of persistent Italian propaganda in Palestine and because Communism to every Arab means Zionism under another name, as it is represented in Palestine by the Jewish Communist Colonies in Galilee.

People regard Palestine as a Moslem or a Jewish question, and overlook the large Christian element. Jerusalem is the capital of Christendom, and the late Orthodox Patriarch was 132nd in descent from the first Bishop, 'James, the brother of the Lord.' Through centuries of oppression and persecution the Eastern Churches have kept the Faith, whose debtors are we of the safer West. They look now to the Church of England for help in many ways, particularly in education; and only in Christian schools is it possible to fuse differences of race, creed, and party into one comradeship of classroom and playground. Every Church is represented in Jerusalem, and the Anglican Arabs are an important section, though small.

Partition does not offer a solution of the Palestine trouble; at the best it offers hope of a settlement. If their mutual dislike of it invites Arab and Jew to a common effort to find a less unwelcome plan, the Royal Commission will have succeeded up to that point. If Arabs, Jews, and British meet together at a Round Table Conference in London, if they bring to the task the special gifts of their respective races, lit by a common love of Palestine and of peace, a way to peace can be found that all can keep together. For a three-fold cord is not quickly broken.

E. M. E. BLYTH.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Archæological Research in India.** Defoe. James Sutherland.
Sir Aurel Stein.
Battlefield of the Gods. Pal Kelemen.
Sian : a Coup d'Etat. Chiang Kai-shek.
Oriental Spotlight. Rameses and Roly.
Commonwealth or Anarchy. Sir John Marriott.
This Freedom of Ours. Frank Birch.
The Civil War and Reconstruction. J. G. Randall.
Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex. G. B. Harrison.
The First Queen Elizabeth. Katharine Davies.
Anatole France. Edward Preston Dargan.
Lucie Duff Gordon. Gordon Waterfield.
Literary Appreciations. George McLean Harper.
- Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns.** Walter Clyde Curry.
The Voyage to Ilyria. Kenneth Muir and Sean O'Loughlin.
Germany's New Religion. Wilhelm Hauer, Karl Heim, and Karl Adam.
The Destiny of Man. Nicolas Berdyaev.
The Theory and Art of Mysticism. Radahakmal Mukerjee.
The Wisdom of God. Sergius Bulgakov.
The Beloved Community. Roger Lloyd.
Sectarian History. G. G. Coulton.
Modern Painting in England. Mary Chamot.
Enquiry into Industrial Art in England. Nikolaus Pevsner.
Composition for Photographers. Charles Simpson.
The Science of Dining. A. S. Way.

FEW can bring to the combination of Geography with Archæology the wide experience, keen insight, and imaginative mastery of the veteran author who, in 'Archæological Reconnaissances in North-Western India and South-Eastern Iran' (Macmillan), gives to the world the results of two seasons' travel in the desolate regions between the Persian Gulf and British Baluchistan. As a record of travel alone, Sir Aurel Stein's journey through Makran would deserve honourable mention in the annals of exploration, through districts largely unsurveyed and under famine conditions which added heavily to the difficulties of transport; the extent of the undertaking, 'from the extreme south-east of Persian Makran through Baluchistan to Kerman' and 'thence south to Minab at the mouth of the Persian Gulf and along its forbidding coast as far as Bushire, may be judged from the aggregate marching distances amounting to more than 2400 miles.' When to this accomplishment are added the mind of a scientist and the imagination of a poet, a book is produced whose enduring value will be welcomed by many generations of readers. The wastes

of Makran will ever be associated in the minds of men with the march of Alexander's returning army, and Sir Aurel Stein begins his investigations, suitably enough, on the banks of the Jhelum, the ancient Hydaspes, and fixes the crossing of the river and the battle with Porus at the modern site of Jalappur. The manner in which he reaches this conclusion, combining his classical evidence with inferences furnished by careful examination of the district—the physical changes wrought by erosion or shifting of river-beds, which always loom so large in the treeless landscapes of Asia, the imaginative use of modern evidence to elucidate the past—prove how much can be accomplished by some one who, with Sir Aurel Stein's equipment of knowledge behind him, will adventure from his study into the open world and 'pay adequate attention to all geographical facts.' The most important part of the book, however, is that which deals with the many prehistoric and early historic sites which Sir Aurel discovered, beginning with the great burial mound of Damba-koh and its neighbourhood, continuing through the rich finds of the Bampur basin and the Halil Rud, up to the Kerman district, and ending with the mounds of the Galehdar valley behind the coastal range of the Gulf. The beautiful plates at the end of the book give some idea of the richness and variety of the prehistoric ware he has discovered.

Mr Pal Kelemen rightly calls his '**Battlefield of the Gods**' (Allen and Unwin) aspects of Mexican history, art, and exploration; for it is not a complete survey but rather takes glimpses of brilliant pageantry in which incidents of strange tyranny and cruelty occurred, with, of course, no small degree of heroism and self-sacrifice to counter them. More than picturesque, full of rich colour, is that ancient scene, with Montezuma in his jewelled glory and with his legendary hosts of Aztecs confronting stout Cortez, who after his landing found in the natives there a simplicity and kindness that might have been a lasting foundation of goodness and happiness had it not been for Spanish rapacity, blood-lust, and narrowness of creed. All that old magnificence is brought by the author into striking contrast with the Yucatan and Mexico of to-day, wherein the Maya go as leisurely about their work, enjoying the modern life in the cities and yet,

through the ruins of wonderful buildings about them and the age-old customs they have inherited, keeping in touch with the very long ago. In this book the past and present are excellently blended, as also are the dazzle and the blood. Among the likenesses between old and new, Mr Kelemen suggests a resemblance, if not a direct connection, between the ancient head-dress of the Maya high-priest, the modern bishop's mitre, and—our own tall hat.

The little that most Europeans know or remember of events far-off is instanced by '*Sian : a Coup d'Etat*' (China Publishing Co., Shanghai), that tells of a mutiny instigated by Communists towards the end of last year in the loyal republican army of China and resulted in its Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, being captured and held in durance for a fortnight. In the buzz of world events such a distant happening, which the Generalissimo believed had 'shocked the whole world,' merely fluttered public interest here for a day or two; but it had its significance, as this attractively produced book reveals. The diary of the Generalissimo, kept in his captivity, is preceded by his brave and spirited wife's account of the mutiny and its effects as she saw them; and she went by air to Sian to share his danger, and, incidentally, helped to his release, so that she knows. The mutiny was more than a little topsy-turvy, for its leaders were among the Generalissimo's earlier devoted followers and had learnt from him the principles of liberty and loyalty which had come to him from his wife's brother-in-law, the famous Sun Yat Sen. It was not long, therefore, before, through the force and wisdom of his personality, his captors were concerned to release him without losing face with their temporary red masters. The book discloses something of the moral heroism and ideals which inspire the reborn China that has supplanted the old decadent imperial régime; and it is only to be hoped that the troubles now threatening her securities will not destroy that new spiritual life, for it looks as if it might be not only an influence of saving to the Eastern world, but an example also to the West.

The recent circumstance of the Egyptian Government, in refusing to admit to their ancient and royal land '*Oriental Spotlight*' (Murray), written by 'Rameses' and illustrated by 'Roly,' is a pity, for if to be ridiculed

is sometimes an astringent medicine, the dose contained in this book is as gentle as the smile of an innocent and not at all irritant. It is true that the Egyptians are freely laughed at—'Fellahs, who are good fellows; Effendis, who are not so good; Pashas, who are preposterous; and Greek grocers who die for England's sake, they are always murdered when a mob turns anti-British'—but so also are many of the British there, military officers, civil servants, tourists, and officials. There is give as well as take. Even the Australian soldiers who in the War taught the Pyramids things and learnt them too, are not let off in this genial volume, which also considers with gay irresponsible irony the Sudan and Palestine. But really! Laughter is so necessary to these times, especially in the worlds where they talk and sometimes think politics, that the more it is encouraged the better; and therefore Rameses, with his wit, and Roly, with his comic drawings, deserve something better than a closed door.

Sir John Marriott has written an interesting and useful book in his 'Commonwealth or Anarchy' (Philip Allan). Most great wars in modern history have been followed by proposals to end war permanently—it is the natural reaction. Hitherto all the projects have sooner or later failed. Whether the League of Nations will in the end succeed time alone can tell. Sir John begins with the Great Design of Henry IV of France. Thence he passes to seventeenth-century projects associated with the names of Crucé, Grotius, Hobbes, and Saint Pierre. Thence to the project of William Penn and the Quakers, followed in the eighteenth century by Rousseau and Bentham. With the nineteenth century came the Holy Alliance, which at any rate existed otherwise than on paper and for many years largely controlled the destiny of Europe. Through the Manchester school and peace by commerce, the subsequent growth of nationalism and imperialism, we pass to The Hague Conferences, to the Great War of 1914, and the League of Nations. This book throws an interesting light on the study of peace, and Sir John, as always, writes with conciseness and clarity.

Those who have listened to Mr Frank Birch's wireless talks should be glad to have them available in book

form as they are in **'This Freedom of Ours'** (Cambridge University Press). His subject is wide, having reference to Church, Government, Forces, Law, Parliament, and Trade, as well as discussing our civil liberties—the Free Man versus the State and the Free Man in Society. The whole is an explanation of a plea for democracy. Without undue exaggeration it might be summed up that, whereas some states say to the individual, 'The law allows you to do this or that definitely laid down, and beyond that all is forbidden,' our tradition is rather: 'You may do what you like, provided the Law does not say that you must not'—even though, in the complications of our legal system, it is often difficult to know exactly what the Law has said. It is an interesting and instructive book.

At last, in **'The Civil War and Reconstruction'** (D. C. Heath), we have a full—almost overfull—account of the war between the American North and South; of the complex causes that led to it, the long-drawn agonies of the fighting, and the efforts made, after the collapse of the Confederates and the inevitable peace, to rebuild the United States—and modern America. That end has been accomplished. The Great War in Europe undoubtedly helped to bring together the descendants of the old bitter enemies; but it was a lengthy and difficult process; and until 1917 there still was half-heartedness in mutual sympathy. The labours of Professor J. G. Randall of Illinois University can hardly have been excelled for painstaking and unprejudiced recording. He keeps to the facts and makes little concession to the wish, held by so many, of painting-in his personalities; a process entertaining but apt to lead to unfair values. He leaves the moral of it generally to the judgment of his readers, though clearly the fact stands out of the sad loss suffered in the resettlement through the murder of Abraham Lincoln. Much of the book, as the minor politics with their local and little-known actors, will be redundant to British readers; but that need not prevent its being studied and even enjoyed, for it presents 'the second American Revolution' massively, and with a will to the truth, and is therefore a necessary addition to the historian's best bookshelves.

'The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex' (Cassell) tells the story of one of the most

intrepid and contradictory characters of an extraordinary age. The best-beloved subject of his Queen, as probably Essex was, she beheaded him; with heavy qualms, no doubt, because of his continued attractiveness to her, but yet with firmness and vindictiveness. For besides encroaching dangerously on her royal privileges and wasting the golden opportunities she had given him, Essex had ventured to refer in public angrily to her crooked conditions in a crooked carcase, and the ageing Elizabeth could never forget an insult which burned and no woman could forgive. He ran headlong into the troubles that fatally befell him, for reasons that Dr G. B. Harrison, in this biography, which in its own way is worthy of kinship to Lytton Strachey's study, makes clear. The Earl was spoilt. Her Majesty had showered on him favours and opportunities too rapidly, and the gods who love to endow a child at his birth with two-edged blessings, after Essex in his haste and vanity had squandered his fortunes, brought something like the madness through which they destroy. Dr Harrison has a discerning spirit. With all Devereux's many faults, which even blindness could not fail to see, he had gifts and great qualities; and it is because this biographer sees the lights with the shadows that he makes of him, and Elizabeth, and Raleigh, and Francis Bacon—whose actions needed the justification which he gets—of Southampton and even the Cecils, a series of convincing portraits combined, with the many other actors, into one of the most stirring and pitiless chapters of drama in our English history.

It might have been better, as less misleading, if Miss Katherine Davies had given the name of Elizabeth Woodville to her biography of that little-known royal consort, instead of 'The First Queen Elizabeth' (Lovat Dickson). The trouble in such a study as this, dealing with a leading figure of a period as full of confusion, baseness, contradictoriness, lies, and misunderstandings as that of the Lancastrian and Yorkist reigns, is that it must consist chiefly of conjecture, and falsity and prejudice already have had a long innings over the leading actors then. No time in our island story is so tangled and badly documented, and to secure enough historical facts on which to base a convincing account of Elizabeth Woodville is as baffling as any attempt to catch and keep

moonlight in a sieve. Miss Davies has done her best, but we cannot feel confident of the truth of her written portrait of Elizabeth and her study is necessarily slight. Her hurried reference to Gloucester as 'a little crooked malignant devil' and her printing as appendices parts of Shakespeare's 'Henry the Sixth' and 'Richard the Third' are discouraging. As the supreme of dramatic poets Shakespeare is well enough; but the playwright who could represent Joan of Arc as attended by fiends as her familiar spirits is not to be accepted as an authority for or against any historical character, whether it be Gloucester or Elizabeth Woodville or any one else.

In seven years' time the centenary of 'Anatole France' (Oxford University Press) will be celebrated, and there is every prospect, provided the world does not meanwhile fall to further wars and foolishness, that it will be a celebration of some fervour and many differences of opinion. Pierre Thibault, especially in his resolute paganism, has been amply outspoken against most of the orthodoxies, a fault which the orthodox—invariably in the majority, although they do not always prove it—consistently decline to forgive. But when that centenary comes, this work of Professor Edward Preston Dargan of Chicago University is bound to be used and quoted as a first authority; for although it treats only of the first fifty years of the Master's life, its contents are representative of him throughout his slowly changeable career. Through those years we see him progressively growing in intellectual greatness; yet blotched as well with those frailties and obstinacies which make greatness human. The manifold debt that he owed to Madame de Caillavet, who poached him and 'produced' him, is evident; and it is curious that she should have made a social figure of one who before his glory grew about him was rather a commonplace if eccentric figure. While her insight was clear and her methods were dark, it is worth while to wonder, without being able to come to any decisive conclusion, whether Anatole France would not have been as great an artist without her, for the root of the matter and the spirit were in him. This is a full and fascinating study of a strange and complex personality, a naughtily independent philosopher, as well as a great Frenchman.

Originality, with brightness of heart and mind,

was a characteristic strong in 'Lucie Duff Gordon' (Murray), and an inheritance passed to her by her mother, Sarah Austin, and in turn transmitted, with modifications, to her daughter, Janet Ross, whose villa near Florence is still happily remembered by many as a centre of hospitality and Victorian reminiscences. This biography, written by Lady Duff Gordon's great-grand nephew, Mr Gordon Waterfield, makes prominent the personalities of those three women; especially that of its particular star, Lucie, who, beside her proved powers for friendship with so-called high and so-called low, developed a spirit of moral independence that was expressed in warm practical sympathy for the 'natives' and others nominally, and often too really, underneath in South Africa and Egypt, where because of the consumption which eventually killed her, she had to live her later years. The interesting people encountered in this volume—familiarily, and not as mere names—are many as is illustrated in a passing manner by the experiences of Mrs Ross. At the age of three she told Carlyle not to be rude to her mother; accompanied by her parents she drank tea with Horace Walpole's friends, the Misses Berry; she remembered sitting on Macaulay's knee and of Thackeray drawing pictures for her. The most touching incidents of that character in the book relate to Heine: 'a fat short man with a sensual mouth.' It was at Boulogne, whither he had fled to forget a love-affair, that Lucie Duff Gordon first met him. She sang to him English ballads and he wrote a poem to her 'black-brown eyes.' Years afterwards she heard that he was poor and dying in Paris. So she called at his lodging and found him lying on a pile of mattresses, wasted and almost blind. Again three years later she visited and tended him in answer to a note addressed to 'Highly Honoured Great British Goddess Lucie.'

The inspiration that comes from a cultured and sincere mind has always been evident in the works of Professor George McLean Harper of Princeton, as many of our readers know; for he has contributed not infrequently to these pages; and it still is evident in 'Literary Appreciations' (Bobbs Merrill), his latest book so far. The work contains studies of the poetry of George Herbert, of Wordsworth, and Sir William Watson, this last one

being a courageous tribute to the uneven genius of a man whose only partial success must have been due to the difficulties that, through faults of temperament, he brought against himself. There are lovable tributes to Coleridge and Charles Lamb, and a warm appreciation of 'Glorious Sir Walter' as a great teller of tales. The brilliant idiosyncrasies of Sir Thomas Browne, the excellent variety of Katherine Mansfield as a writer of short stories, and Milton's poetic story of the love-romance of Adam and Eve, happily round a volume that is rich in suggestion and incidentally, through its diversity and range of studies, a tribute to the greatness of the English literary heart and mind.

The lives of few of those whose names are literary household words have been so generally obscure as that of 'Defoe' (Methuen); a defect now removed by Mr James Sutherland's biography. To many the man was lost behind the glamour of 'Robinson Crusoe.' Mr Sutherland, however, does an injustice to Defoe's 'vast vague and cheerful public' in suggesting that they suspect him to be also the author of that rubbish of feeble invention, which added to the boredom of Victorian childhood, 'The Swiss Family Robinson.' But here is the story of Defoe's chequered life-career, told with a frankness that spares him none of the 'warts' that spoilt his spiritual countenance. We are shown no romantic figure, but an eagerly adventurous and generally unsuccessful tradesman, who, as Harley's political broker and hack, was also busy in the sideways and backstairs of the State, and certainly useful in helping to secure the Union between England and Scotland; a Protestant whose puritanism, however, as compared with that of Bunyan, was 'a very greasy flame,' and a pamphleteer of such industry and vigour that he became at times the most popular and hated person of his noisy day. It is impossible really to like this uncertain gentleman. Too little of the private man is shown to relieve the ardours of the indefatigable advocate, whose commercial practices were queer and whose accounts were generally wrong, and we should gladly have seen more of him who gave the world those works of imagination, that were the pioneers of reality in fiction. This is an honest and therefore a helpful biography.

Again we welcome from the United States a work of scholarly value, this time on 'Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns' (Louisiana State University Press) and written by Professor Walter Clyde Curry of Vanderbilt University. At the beginning it promised to invite one to formidable depths; but the style has such grace and lucidity that those early fears were soon dispersed and we discovered a study of Shakespeare's metaphysical and supernatural beliefs of rich and interesting suggestion. He lived, of course, at a time of remarkable energy of thought and action; and in the manner of the true artist absorbed that energy and expressed it as suited his purpose in his plays. When, therefore, he came to deal with 'Macbeth' and 'The Tempest' and their supernatural applications, in the former with the weird sisters, not ordinary witches but 'in reality demons, actual representatives of the world of darkness opposed to good'; and in 'The Tempest' with Prospero using his enchantments virtuously, and helped by the spiritual Ariel—he went to the credulities of his time for their substance insubstantial, using them for their dramatic values and not for any mere metaphysical import, for the reason that he possessed no formal philosophical system. In the figure of Macbeth especially the effects of such agencies are brought out, and, through the usurper's ambitions, fears, doubts, and final recognition of life's great ironies, the dramatist expressed his own convictions.

The new study of Shakespeare which Mr Kenneth Muir and Mr Sean O'Loughlin have written under the imaginative and appropriate title of 'The Voyage to Illyria' (Methuen) is full of suggestion, and although we feel sometimes that their theories are a little strained and are unable to accept with a similar confidence all those whom they quote as possessing authority, we welcome it as a sincere and helpful interpretation of the motives and impulses of Shakespeare that affected for bad and for good his works and life. 'Shakespearean tragedy is in a very real sense, the tragedy of Shakespeare himself.' Such conjectures as that of Titania's Indian boy being the embryonic Ariel, and of the Pyramus and Thisbe play being 'in fact' a parody of the tragedy of Romeo and Juliet, are too far-fetched. We prefer to believe that the Pyramus interlude is rather a burlesque

of the ways of Marlowe, as 'in fact' in his own place Pistol is. Such conjectures are, however, trifles, and in so sensible a work, therefore, less welcome, except as fanciful embroideries. The particular value of the book rests in its investigation of the probability of Southampton's changeableness or treachery in the affair of pagan love, as uncertainty revealed in the Sonnets—which the Authors wisely use in their earliest order—being the cause of the profound unsettlement in Shakespeare's life which came eventually to the passion of the great tragedies and then to his peace of heart.

A work of striking quality that serves a 'felt purpose' has come from the University of Tübingen. Written by three of the Professors of that historic centre of learning, it examines frankly the cases for and against 'Germany's New Religion' (Allen and Unwin); a subject over which the thought of other countries in these years naturally is concerned. The case for is put by Professor Wilhelm Hauer, and that against separately from German Protestant and Roman Catholic points of view by Professors Karl Heim and Karl Adam respectively. We shall be excused if in this place we pay particular attention to the case for Germany's new religion, as the opponents, with all their freshness of outlook and breadth of survey, naturally cover ground that has been very frequently traversed already in religious discussions. The new religion of Herr Hitler's 'Third Empire,' as it is called, does not re-adopt the old Scandinavian deities; nor apparently does it repudiate the Man Jesus, who, indeed, according to Professor Hauer, had possibly some Aryan blood in his veins, 'on account of the mixture of races in the Near East.' But it does repudiate his divinity and him as a leader and a pattern, with all else of Christian credalism, and goes back to God, the Creator, with a frank acceptance of the truth that pain, tragedy, and death are of the primal essentials of life and that He is the chosen God of the German peoples whom also He has chosen. Although this new Faith Movement is claimed as of an especial tribal significance, it is bound to react on religious thought elsewhere, being so forthright a return to the monotheistic and, therefore, is a challenge to more than orthodox theology.

Any work from the pen of Nicolas Berdyaev is bound

to brace and stimulate intellectually, and tend to some release from stereotyped habitudes of grooved thought. His new volume, 'The Destiny of Man' (Bles), fulfils those certainties utterly; and it would be well if the clergy especially, in reading it, re-affirmed to themselves the principles of their faith; for the general effect can only be to strengthen those bases of true Christianity that most represent the example, spirit, and teachings of its Originator which in no branch of the universal Church have remained undistorted. This is not to say that M. Berdyaev's views are not intensely personal and individual. They are so; but they are expressed in such a spirit of gentle reasonableness that only extremists on either side would be much perturbed through them. His approach to religious truth is rather mystical than philosophical, although he emphasises the necessity of its ethical foundations, as well as of its reality. His difference from the Roman fixities is profound; but so it is also from those of the too individual Protestant. He repudiates the Catholic denial of 'the freedom of conscience in subduing it to priestly authority'; but also repudiates opposite extreme for excess of liberty indulged. He properly applies religious principles to conduct in the world; as with capital punishment. 'The law which sentenced to death Socrates and afterwards Jesus Christ can no longer be regarded as competent to decide on matters of life and death,' and in regard to our recently debated problems of marriage proclaims the difference between the union that is spiritual, with all its realities, and that which is merely of 'convenience': 'Most marriages have no mystical meaning and have nothing to do with eternity.' The instances we have given represent the philosophic breadth, exaltedness, and practical wisdom of this volume which is so necessary to thinkers that the absence of an index is a loss.

Mysticism, that inward contemplation of divine wisdom and quest of 'unfathomable Reality,' has held so close a fascination to Western and especially to Eastern minds, hearts, and personalities, that it is bound to call for guidance; and we have found a helpful influence to that effect in Dr Radhakmal Mukerjee's 'Theory and Art of Mysticism' (Longmans). We can give assurance to those who seek the truths that mystical ecstasy may

reveal—as through a cloud, yet vividly—that here is a wide survey of spiritual reality, written with imaginative charm and sincerity. The ample scope of the investigation is only equalled by its complexities; for individuals evidently experience diverse manifestations of mystical truth, and the infinite aspects of religion, of love, of sexual impulse, and much else, that necessarily differ to some indefinable extent with every living person, bring their elements of uncertainty to a study that yet is based on realities as true as sunlight and the earth at our feet. Formality is the enemy of mysticism, and, therefore, because of it cleavages may result between personal and institutional religion; which brings out the consequence that in this age of the machine, of organised social communities and iron dictatorships, the mystics have their privileges of detachment which must be serviceable to others in life, although but indirectly. Mysticism is as necessary as poetry and the humanities are necessary, and that is why such a work as Dr Mukerjee's is valuable.

Sophiology is an expression of the Christian faith, no less involved and complicated than any other form of orthodox belief and, it seems, brought to reality through the troubles to which the Church has fallen in Russia. 'The Wisdom of God' (Williams and Norgate), it is more than that, being also an expression of the Glory of God and shows that devotional and highly theological thought, as well as the emotions of worship, are its essentials. This brief summary of Sophiology written by Father Sergius—the Very Reverend Sergius Bulgakov, an exile from Russia and now the Dean of the Russian Theological Institute in Paris—has for trained theologians a lucidity that yet must be dark, abstruse, and difficult to the general. In bringing out the truth it makes no concessions to simplification, as might have been expected through the buffetings and worse which the faithful of Russia have had to endure for their discipline. The position of the cult of St Sophia is best illustrated by the position of the Virgin Mary. Unlike the Roman belief, her immaculate conception does not rid her of original sin, yet the indifference of Protestantism to her is repudiated and 'at the last agony of the age, in the terrible judgment of Christ, she will be present only in order to intercede.'

Canon Roger Lloyd belongs to that development,

rather than outgrowth, of the Anglican Church, the Modernist movement, which through its readiness to face difficult facts and give them an explanation according to the reasoning of the spirit in this age, is the most hopeful for religion in that or in any other living communion. In **'The Beloved Community'** (Nisbet) he examines the present tendency to act in communities, organised and sometimes dictatorial, and compares that gregariousness with individual action. He covers a wide field, ancient and modern, political or social and religious; and after some excursions, without any alarms, comes to see in the Church, especially in that of England, the happiest compromise towards securing beneficent results, which are not altogether of the world worldly. This is a right call. If the ills of our rapid life, hurtling along and scrambling, mechanistically and militarily intolerant, are to be soothed, healed, and removed, it can only be through the spirit of Christ, as exemplified in His Church as it strives truly to live according to His example. As should be, among the clergy especially, Canon Lloyd is hopeful, even confident over that. His book is brave in its purpose and in its expression modest and clear. His quotation from Henley, however, is misleading. That virile, crippled poet, challenged by his physical disabilities, did not say, 'Man is the master of his fate, Man is the captain of his soul,' but something far more resolutely egoistical.

It does the heart good to see a redoubtable warrior and octogenarian youth, like Dr G. G. Coulton, hurling his challenges and trailing his coat perseveringly in the endeavour to get certain sectarian historians, and in particular Father Thurston of the Jesuits, to clear up points and face challenges and critical issues—before which, however, they appear to show some diffidence. As published by himself (at 72, Kimberley Road, Cambridge), Dr Coulton makes a clear case in **'Sectarian History'** for more frankness than his adversaries seem to have given in their controversial ways. Even if this call receives no answer, it is yet worth while—and the half-crown involved—as an example of outspokenness and of discernment over the methods of some writers.

In her study of **'Modern Painting in England'** (Country Life) Mary Chamot has taken a more generous

span of period and artists and their achievements than her title suggests; possibly because that over-frequent word 'modernist' has tended to out-mode 'modern.' She recognises as a starting-point the 'mock mediævalism' of Burne-Jones, with Whistler as a sharp corrective to it and a lasting influence on many-sided English art. The old subject-picture had its shattering blow, at least for a time; and the purpose of the artist was to represent in pigments his impressions as well as he could; and as those liberties led to such aspects of truth, or bathos or worse, as were represented in post-impressionism, cubism, sur-realism, and what-not, much scope was given for incompetence to romp in and cause many who were more afraid of being out-of-fashion than anything else to give an implied or half-hearted—though sometimes it was brazenly shouted—benediction to rubbish. In spite of those absurdities, as they were, the richness in the variety and quality of English painting in the last fifty years, as shown in this discerning and finely-illustrated volume, has been remarkable. Mary Chamot begins with a hint of apology for English art as not equal to that of the French, and doubtless on the whole that is justified; but for courage, sincerity, and workmanship, modern British painting holds its own.

Having realised that English Art, in spite of many faddists and absurdities, is healthily active and realising much of the imaginative beauty of life, we turn to its application to the necessities of a highly commercialised and mechanised existence; and are helped in this by an 'Enquiry into Industrial Art in England' (Cambridge University Press), made by Dr Nikolaus Pevsner, under the auspices of Birmingham University and with that great industrial city as the centre of his investigations. The results are striking, especially in the manner in which a simple dignity has often been wedded to utility. The ingenuity shown, too, in the designs is striking; but fully to realise these truths it is requisite to go to the volume itself, with its clearly-stated doctrine and well-selected vivid photographs. The results of following such guidance as is here given and suggested must be incalculable; and, indirectly, those dreadful slums, a blot and a shame to our civilisation, must disappear.

Time was when the pretensions of photographers to

be taken as artists in their craft brought scorn to the artistic. So greatly, however, has photography improved, in the choice and composition of its subjects, in the selective grading of lights and shadows, in the expression of beauty and emotion, and much else, that artists themselves are caught by it, and find it not only of interest, but suggestively useful in their own creative work. And now they are ready to help their cousins of the camera! Mr Charles Simpson, R.I., for instance, has written a guide to '**Composition for Photographers**' (Witherby) which gives very helpful advice. The author is able to illustrate his points with pencil as well as pen; and, taking examples, illustrates by word and drawing, how they could be dealt with, spoilt, or improved. Incidentally, also, he shows the limitations of the camera as compared with the inspirations of the artist—or of Nature. It cannot reproduce sunshine or moonlight in as truthful beauty as a painter can. Altogether this is an excellent volume and readable to others beside those eager amateur craftsmen to whom it is addressed.

Dr A. S. Way has translated into English a work which, he avers, has not been so done before, except in the sixteenth century and in fragments, when he believes Shakespeare may have seen something of it and gained from it a little of Falstaff's inspiration on that blessed subject Drink. He calls it '**The Science of Dining**' (Macmillan), and thinks it was written in the thirteenth century by Michael Scott, who, in turn, went for his material to earlier sages. It is, indeed, a curious book; a sort of mediæval foretaste of the Philosopher at the Breakfast Table; as in it beside descriptions and analyses of the effects of food and drink, as that pigeon pullets generate inflammation in the blood, and truffles crude phlegm, and chestnuts excite concupiscence, it raises questions as to whether fishes masticate and why their eggs crackle in fire more than other eggs. Towards the end it tells mildly humorous stories, possibly as hints of the table-talk which cheered the meal. On the whole they would have been approved by Sir Robert Walpole; though Dr Way has taken care not to shock. Anyhow, they show in their writer, or compiler, a severe contempt for the morals of the Church of his day.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH VOLUME OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[*Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.*]

A.

- Abyssinia, and the League of Nations, 17-18.
Adam, Karl, part author of 'Germany's New Religion,' 369.
Addis, Sir Charles, K.C.M.G., 'The New Monetary Technique,' 64.
Allen, G. C., Ph.D., 'State Intervention in Industry,' 268.
'Amberley Papers,' 15.
Ancient Monuments, 228-245.
Arbuthnot, Robert, 285-286.
Arundell of Wardour, Lord, 228.
Austria, reasons for survival of independence of, 74-78—Fascism in, 79-80—under the Hapsburgs, 80-81—prospects of Hapsburg Restoration in, 82-86.
Austrian Tangle, The, 74-87.
Aynesworth, Allen, 266.

B.

- Bagehot, Walter, 1, 203.
Baker, Ernest, 'History of the English Novel,' 185.
Baker, G. C., 'The Issue in Tanganyika,' 119.
Baldwin, Lord, 1-23.
Balfour, late Lord, 4-6, 8, 11, 159, 203, 312-313, 347, 350.
Bartolomeo de Sparta, 29.
Barton, Andrew, 337-340.
Barton, John, 332, 337-338.

Vol. 269.—No. 534.

Barton, Sir Robert, 335, 337-339.

Barton, Sir William, K.C.I.E., 'The Crown and Federation in India,' 39.

Bean, C. E. W., 'The Australian Imperial Force in France,' 177.

Beaverbrook, Lord, 6-7.

Benesh, President, 76, 84.

Benson, A. C., joint editor of 'The Letters of Queen Victoria,' 298.

Bentinck, Lord William, policy in Sicily of, 305-306.

Berdyaev, Nicolas, 'The Destiny of Man,' 369-370.

de la Bere, Rupert, M.P., 189-190.

Bethlen, Count Stephen, 75.

Beton, Cardinal, 96-97.

Birch, Frank, 'This Freedom of Ours,' 363.

Birrell, Augustine, 13, 203.

Bismarck, 81, 87, 123, 129, 146, 299, 310-312.

Blacklock, Thomas, 288, 297.

Blair, Hugh, 294-295, 297.

Blaker, Richard, 'David of Judah,' 186.

Blyth, E. M. E., 'The Palestine Report,' 341.

Blyton, W. J., 'Government and the Individual,' 203.

Boleyn, Anne, Henry VIII's letters to, 89-90, 93.

Bolingbroke, on Cromwell's foreign policy, 304.

Bonar Law, Andrew, 7-9, 11.

Books, Some Recent, 176-189, 359-374.

- Boswell, James, 281, 283-297.
 Boswell, Dr John, 289.
 Boyd-Carpenter, Bishop, 141.
 Briand, A., 163, 166, 168-169, 171.
 Bright, John, 138.
 British Fisheries, *The*, 314-328.
 British Foreign Policy, 298-313.
 Bronner, Augusta F., joint author of 'New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment,' 105.
 Brownings, *New Light on the*, 48-63.
 Buckle, G. E., joint editor of 'The Letters of Queen Victoria,' 298.
 Buckmaster, late Lord, 190-191, 201.
 Bulgakov, Sergius, 'The Wisdom of God,' 371.
 Burke, Edmund, 4, 6, 136-137.
 Bute, Lord, 231, 243.
 Byng, Hon. John, 228-229.
 Byrne, M. St Clare, editor of 'Letters of King Henry VIII. A Selection, with other Documents,' 88.

C.

- Cadogan, Hon. Edward, 'The Roots of Evil,' 105, 107-108, 117.
 Canning, George, 302, 306-308, 313.
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, and Matrimonial Causes Bill, 193, 198-200, 202.
 Carter, Sir Morris, 341.
 Cassilis, Earl of, and Henry VIII, 96-97.
 Castlereagh, Lord, 157, 298, 306-307.
 Cecil, *Algernon*, 'Lord Baldwin,' 1, —'British Foreign Secretaries, 1807-1916,' 298.
 Cecil, Lord, and Matrimonial Causes Bill, 195-196, 200-201.
 Chamberlain, Sir Austen, and League of Nations, 158-171—and Mr Baldwin, 161, 163-164, 175—and Mussolini, 161, 173—and China, 167-168—and Kellogg Pact, 169-170—and Abyssinian Question, 172-173—appreciation of, 174-175—and extraterritoriality in China, 248.

- Chamberlain, Sir Austen, *A Great Conservative Foreign Secretary*, 157-175.
 Chamberlain, Joseph, 138.
 Chamot, Mary, 'Modern Painting in England,' 372-373.
 Charles I, 2.
 Charles V, Emperor, 94.
 Chettle, H. F., 'Ancient Monuments,' 228.
 China, *Extraterritoriality in*, 246-257.
 Chough, *The Problem of the*, 215-227.
 Chung-hui, Dr Wang, 253.
 Church, State, and Divorce, 189-202.
 Churchill, Winston, 1, 6, 22, 342.
 Cicero, 134.
 Colville, Lady, and Dr Johnson, 293, 296.
 Coulton, G. G., 'Sectarian History,' 372.
 Coupland, Professor R., 341.
 Cromer, Lord, 265.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 2, 304.
 Cromwell, Thomas, 89, 98, 205, 239.
 Crosbie, Andrew, 287-288.
 Crossman, R. H. 'Plato To-day,' 183.
 Crowe, Sir Eyre, 300 *note*.
 Crown and Federation in India, *The*, 39-47.
 Curry, Walter Clyde, 'Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns,' 368.
 Curzon, Marquess, 7-8, 157-158, 160, 164-165, 170, 233, 243.

D.

- Danæus, 'Dialogue of Witches,' 29.
 de Darányi, and Hapsburg Restoration, 85.
 Dargan, Edward Preston, 'Anatole France,' 365.
 Davies, Godfrey, 'The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660'..178-179.

Davies, Katherine, 'The First Queen Elizabeth,' 364-365.

Débidour, A., 'Histoire Diplomatique de l'Europe, 1815-1878,' 298.

Demosthenes, 132, 134.

Derby, Lord, and Queen Victoria, 310.

Disraeli, 3, 5-6, 10, 14, 132, 134-136, 139, 157-158, 263, 302, 310-313.

Divorce reform, religious differences inherent in, 192-196—attitude of State towards, 197-198—attitude of Church towards, 198-200, 202—relation of Church and State as result of, 201-202.

Dollfuss, Chancellor, 77, 83.

Douglas, Duchess of, and Dr Johnson, 282-283, 287.

Dr Johnson in Edinburgh, 281-297.

Dryden, Alice, 231.

Dunsinnan, Lord, 293, 297.

E.

East, Norwood, 'Medical Aspects of Crime,' 105, 112.

Eden, Anthony, 14, 18, 166, 173.

Edmonds, Brig.-Gen. Sir James, editor of 'Military Operations: France and Belgium, 1918'..176-177.

Edward VII, 312-313.

Edward VIII, 21-22.

Elibank, Patrick, Lord, 292-293, 295-296.

Elizabeth, Queen, foreign policy of, 303-304.

Elliott Smith, Sir G., 'On Human History,' 23.

Erskine, Hon. Andrew, 294.

Erskine, Dr John, 286, 295.

Esher, Viscount, joint editor of 'The Letters of Queen Victoria,' 264-265, 298.

Ewing, A. C., 'The Morality of Punishment,' 105, 110.

Extraterritoriality in China, 246-257.

F.

Federation in India, The Crown and, 39-47.

Feisal, Emir, 346.

Fisheries, The British, 314-328.

Florimond, on Witchcraft, 28.

Forbes, Sir William, and Dr Johnson, 282, 284-285, 287-288, 295.

Forestry, 145-156.

Fortescue, Sir John, on Henry VIII, 102-103.

G.

Galpin, Francis, 'Textbook of European Musical Instruments,' 187.

Gardiner, S. R., 2.

George V, 1, 21, 267.

George VI, 258.

Gladstone, W. E., 132, 135, 138-139, 146, 194, 263, 301-302, 312.

Glover, Dr Edward, 'The Dangers of Being Human,' 109, 114-115.

Glueck, Sheldon, 'Crime and Justice,' 105, 108, 111, 116.

Goebbels, Dr, 129.

Gömbös, General, 85.

Gooch, G. P., joint editor of 'British Documents on the Origins of the War,' 298.

Gordon, Hon. Alexander, 296.

Gordon, Douglas, 'The Problem of the Chough,' 215.

Gore, Bishop, 141.

Gorell, Lord, 'Church, State, and Divorce,' 189.

Gorell, late Lord, and divorce reform, 191-192, 197, 201-202.

Government and the Individual, 203-214.

Granville, Lord, 300-301.

Gray, W. Forbes, 'Dr Johnson in Edinburgh,' 281.

Gray, Dr Zachary, 38.

Green, J. R., on Burke, 136.

Gregory, James, 289.

Grey of Fallodon, Lord, 8, 10-11, 14-15, 162, 172, 233.

Grey, Lady Jane, 104.

Guedalla, Philip, 'The Queen and Mr Gladstone,' 260.

H.

Hailes, Lord, 282, 289, 296.

Halyburton, Andrew, 332, 338.

Hammond, Sir Laurie, 341.

Harper, George McLean, 'Literary Appreciations,' 366-367.

Harrison, G. B., 'The Life and Death of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex,' 363-364.

Hauer, Wilhelm, part author of 'Germany's New Religion,' 369.

Healy, W., joint author of 'New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment,' 105, 108-109.

Heim, Karl, part author of 'Germany's New Religion,' 369.

Henderson, Arthur, 170.

Henry the Eighth, The Personality of, 88-104.

Henry VII, and Scottish Sea-Dogs, 335-336.

Henry VIII, and Scottish Sea-Dogs, 337, 339.

Herbert, A. P., 190, 202.

Hewart, Lord, 116.

Hicks Beach, Susan, 'A Cardinal of the Medici,' 185-186.

Hill, Birkbeck, 'Footsteps of Dr Johnson in Scotland,' 284, 292.

Hitler, 74, 76, 78, 83-84, 86-87, 126-130, 133, 166.

Hitti, Philip K., 'History of the Arabs,' 180-181.

Hoare, Sir Samuel, 18.

Hoare-Laval Agreement, 18.

Housman, A. E., 'Introductory Lecture,' 184-185.

Housman, Laurence, 'Victoria Regina,' 260-262, 264-265, 267.

Hussein, King, 345-346, 357.

I.

India, The Crown and Federation in, 39-47.

Indian States, relations with Crown of, 39-41.

Industry, State Intervention in, 268-280.

Innocent VIII, and Witchcraft, 29.

Issue in Tanganyika, The, 119-131.

Ives, George, 'A History of Penal Methods,' 105, 107.

J.

James I, and Witchcraft, 33-36, 38.

James III, of Scotland, 330, 332-334, 338-339.

James IV, of Scotland, 330, 333-334, 336-339.

Johnson, Dr, in Edinburgh, 281-297.

K.

Kai-shek, General Chiang, 253-'Sian: a Coup d'Etat,' 361.

Kaunitz, 299.

Kelemen, Pal, 'Battlefield of the Gods,' 360-361.

Kennedy, A. L., M.C., 'Sir Austen Chamberlain: A Great Conservative Foreign Secretary,' 157.

Kenny, M. J., 'Outlines of Criminal Law,' 111.

Kent, William, 'The Encyclopædia of London,' 188.

Kenyon, Sir Frederic G., 59.

Knox, John, and Witchcraft, 33.

L.

Laing, E. V., 'Forestry,' 145.

Lansdowne, late Lord, 312.

Lawrence, T. E., 75, 344-345.

League of Nations, 14-18, 119, 128, 158-171, 173.

League of Nations Union, Peace
Ballot of, 17-18.
Lecky, W. E. H., 'Democracy and
Liberty,' 4.
Lehzen, Baroness, 259, 261.
Leland, John, 101.
Leopold I of Belgium, 260, 301, 309.
Liddell Hart, B. H., 'Europe in
Arms,' 177.
Liddon, Canon, 141.
Listowel, the Countess of, 'The
Austrian Tangle,' 74.
Litvinoff, 76.
Livingstone, Sir Richard, 4 *note*, 23.
Lloyd George, D., 1, 5-8, 11, 22.
Lloyd, Roger, 'The Beloved Com-
munity,' 371-372.
Locarno, Treaty of, 160, 163-166,
169, 174.
Lord Baldwin, 1-23.
Lounsbury, Thomas R., 56.
Lovat, Lord, and Dr Johnson, 296.
Low, A. M., 105.
Lubbock, Sir John, 229-232.
Luke, Sir Harry, 'The Making of
Modern Turkey,' 181.

M.

Macaulay, Lord, 8, 136.
McCardie, Justice, 114.
MacDonald, Ramsay, 8, 13-14, 17,
158.
MacGregor, Alasdair Alpin, 'The
Sea-Dogs of Scotland,' 329.
Mackenzie, Sir George, 'Criminal
Law,' 37.
Mackinnon, Dr James, 'Calvin and
the Reformation,' 179.
McMahon, Sir Henry, 345.
Malcolm, Sir Ian, K.C.M.G., "'Vic-
toria Regina," 1837-1937'.. 258.
Marriott, Sir John A. R., 'British
Foreign Policy,' 298-'Queen Vic-
toria and her Ministers,' 259-260—
'Commonwealth or Anarchy,' 362.
Mary Tudor, Queen, 95-96.
Matrimonial Causes Act, 1937..190,
195-196, 198-202.

Maule, Mr Justice, 191.
Maurois, André, French version of
'Victoria Regina' of, 261-263.
Mérimée, Prosper, 241, 243.
Metternich, 5, 79, 308.
Milne, Sir J. C. Wardlaw, 253.
Milner, Lord, 121, 249-250.
Milton, John, 'Paradise Lost,' 133-
134.
Monetary Technique, The New,
64-73.
Monuments, Ancient, 228-245.
Morris, Sir Harold, 341.
Morris, William, 229-230.
Mowat, R. B., 'The States of Europe
(1815-1871)'.. 298.
Muir, Kenneth, joint author of 'The
Voyage to Illyria,' 368-369.
Mukerjee, Radhakmal, 'Theory
and Art of Mysticism,' 370-371.
Mussolini, 75-76, 83-84, 86, 161, 173.

N.

von Neurath, Baron, 80.
New Light on the Brownings,
48-63.
New Monetary Technique, The,
64-73.
Newman, Bertram, 'Jonathan
Swift,' 183-184.
Nicholson, Harold, 7, 9.
Noppen, J. G., 'Royal Westminster
and the Coronation,' 182.
Norfolk, Duke of, and Henry VIII,
93-94.

O.

O'Loughlin, Sean, joint author of
'The Voyage to Illyria,' 368-369.
Oman, Sir Charles, K.C.B., D.C.L.,
'The Personality of Henry VIII,'
88-'The Art of War in the Six-
teenth Century,' 177-178.
Oratory, 132-144.
Orde, Baron, and Dr Johnson, 285.
Ormsby Gore, W. G. A., 356.

Otto of Hapsburg, 82-86.
Oxford and Asquith, Lord, 133.

P.

Palestine, Mandate for, 341, 343-347, 349-351, 353-354, 356-357—history of, 342—Arab grievances in, 342-350, 353—situation of Jews in, 343, 347-351, 354—weakness of Administration in, 352-353—hopes of settlement through Partition in, 355-358.

Palestine Report, The, 341-358.

'Palestine Royal Commission, Report of,' 341-342, 345, 347, 349, 351-355, 357.

Palmer, Frederick, Jr., 'New Light on the Brownings,' 48.

Palmer, G. H., 59, 63.

Palmerston, Lord, 263, 300-301, 308-310.

Parker, Dr Joseph, 141-142.

Peel, Earl, 341.

Penal System, Psychological Aspects of Our, 105-118.

Perceval, Spencer, 306.

Personality of Henry VIII, The, 88-104.

Peter the Great, on England, 198.

Pevsner, Nikolaus, 'Enquiry into Industrial Art in England,' 373.

Pibram, A. F., 'England and the International Policy of the European Great Powers, 1871-1914'..298.

Pittscottie, 334-336.

Plumer, Lord, as High Commissioner of Palestine, 350-351.

Poincaré, President, 312.

de la Pole, Edmund, 98-99.

de la Pole, Richard, 99.

Pollock, George, 'Mr Justice McCardie. A Biography,' 105, 114.

Ponsonby, Sir Frederick, 'Sidelights on Queen Victoria,' 260.

Prince Consort, influence on Queen Victoria of, 259-261—and British foreign policy, 309-310.

Problem of the Chough, The, 215-227.

Psychological Aspects of Our Penal System, 105-118.

R.

'Rameses,' 'Oriental Spotlight,' 361-362.

Randall, J. G., 'The Civil War and Reconstruction,' 363.

Read, C. Stanford, M.D., 'Psychological Aspects of Our Penal System,' 105.

Rich, Lieut.-Col. C. E. F., 'Recollections of a Prison Governor,' 105, 113.

Richard III, 100.

Richelieu, Cardinal, 300.

Robertson, William, and Dr Johnson, 282-283, 286-287, 295-296.

'Roly,' illustrator of 'Oriental Spotlight,' 361-362.

Rosebery, late Lord, 138-139, 172.

Rudd, Dorothea, 'The Witches,' 24.

Rumbold, Sir Horace, 341.

Ruskin, John, 229-230.

Russell, Lord John, 301, 309.

Russell of Killowen, Lord, 195-196.

S.

Sadler, A. L., 'The Maker of Modern Japan,' 179-180.

Sadler, Sir Ralph, 96-97.

Saint Aulaire, 'Genève contre la Paix,' 15-16.

Salisbury, late Lord, 138, 157-158, 160, 172, 312.

Salisbury, Margaret, Countess of, 99-100.

Sampson, Agnes, 34-35.

Samuel, Sir Herbert, 349-350.

von Schoenerer, Georg, 78.

Schuschnigg, Dr, 80-81, 83-84, 86.

Schwarzenberg, Prince, and Palmerston, 308-309.

Scotland, The Sea-Dogs of, 329-340.

Scott, Sir Walter, 228, 285, 288, 295.

Sea-Dogs of Scotland, The, 329-340.

Seton-Watson, R. W., 'Britain in Europe, 1789-1914. A Survey of Foreign Policy,' 298, 302, 304-310, 312-'Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question,' 310-311.

Shakespeare, 'Macbeth,' 114-'Julius Caesar,' 134-135.

Simpson, Charles, 'Composition for Photographers,' 373-374.

Sinclair, Rev. G., 'Satan's Invisible World Discovered,' 37.

Sir Austen Chamberlain: A Great Conservative Foreign Secretary, 157-175.

Sitwell, Edith, 'Victoria of England,' 260.

Skene, James, 'Italian Journey,' 186-187.

Snowden, Lord, 13.

Snyder, Edward, 'New Light on the Brownings,' 48.

Some Recent Books, 176-189, 359-374.

Sorel, Albert, 299-300.

Soulsby, Sir William, 143.

Springer, 'Malleus Maleficarum,' 29.

Stanley, Pamela, 266.

State Intervention in Industry, 268-280.

Stedinger, extermination of the, 26-27.

Stein, Sir Aurel, 'Archæological Reconnaissances in North-Western India and South-Eastern Iran,' 359-360.

Stockmar, Baron, 259-261, 264, 308.

Strachey, Lytton, 'Queen Victoria,' 259.

Stresemann, Dr, 161-163, 166, 171.

Sumner, B. H., 'Russia and the Balkans, 1870-1880'..298, 311.

Surrey, Earl of, and Henry VIII, 93-94.

Sutherland, James, 'Defoe,' 367.

T.

Tanganyika, The Issue in, 119-131.

Temperley, Harold, joint editor of 'British Documents on the Origins of the War,' 298, 307 *note*.

Templars, the, and Witchcraft, 27-28.

Thrale, Mrs, 281-284, 288, 291.

Tilman, H. W., 'The Ascent of Nanda Devi,' 187-188.

'Times, The,' on extraterritoriality in China, 252-253.

Tudor, Margaret, 95-96.

V.

Vergennes, on English foreign policy, 298-299.

Victoria, Queen, 258-267, 300-301, 309-312.

'Victoria Regina,' 1837-1937, 258-267.

'Village of Highgate, The,' 188-189.

Violet-le-Duc, 241, 243.

Voltaire, 206, 295.

Voroshiloff, Marshal, 76.

W.

Walpole, Horace, 228, 292.

Wang, Ching-chun, 'Extraterritoriality in China,' 246.

Warbois, Witches of, 31-33.

Waterfield, Gordon, 'Lucie Duff Gordon,' 365-366.

Wates, G. F., 'From World Force to World Fellowship,' 182-183.

Way, A. S., 'The Science of Dining,' 374.

Webb, Mary, 'Precious Bane,' 10.

Weizmann, Dr, 343, 350, 356.

Whistler, Rex, 265-266.

White, William A., 'Insanity and the Criminal Law,' 105, 109-110.

Wilde, Oscar, 'Ballad of Reading Gaol,' 112.

Wilkins, Vaughan, 'And so—Victoria,' 260.

Witchcraft, creed of, 24-26.

Witches, The, 24-38.

Wolsey, Cardinal, 89-90, 95-96, 98-99, 302-304.

Wood, Sir Andrew, 329-330, 332-336.

Wyatt, Sir Thomas, 94.

Y.

York, Archbishop of, and Matrimonial Causes Bill, 198, 200, 202.

Young, G. M., 'Charles I and Cromwell,' 2.

Young, J. R., 'The British Fisheries,' 314.

Z.

Zangwill, Israel, 'Speeches, Articles and Letters,' 181-182.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH VOLUME.

